

200  
22

# CHOSEN TO BE CONSECRATED

*The Bishops of The Methodist Church*  
1784 - 1968

Roy Hunter Short

Published by  
Commission on Archives and History  
for the  
Council of Bishops  
The United Methodist Church  
Lake Junaluska, North Carolina

Copyright © 1976 by  
Commission on Archives and History  
The United Methodist Church

All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publisher, except brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. For information address Commission on Archives and History, Lake Junaluska, North Carolina.

ISBN 0-915466-01-5

Printed by The Mountaineer  
at Waynesville, North Carolina  
United States of America

## CONTENTS

Preface .....	5
I. The Bishops As A Company .....	7
II. The Election of Bishops .....	15
III. The Bishops As A Functioning Body .....	23
IV. The Bishops As Itinerant Superintendents .....	30
V. The Bishops and Their Families .....	35
VI. Friendships and Crosscurrents Among the Bishops .....	41
VII. The Bishops As Individuals .....	50
VIII. The Pulpit Giants .....	59
IX. The Evangelists .....	64
X. The Saint Johns .....	67
XI. The Church Statesmen .....	70
XII. The Church Lawyers .....	74
XIII. The Educators .....	76
XIV. The Scholars .....	81
XV. The Missionaries .....	85
XVI. Friends of the Blacks .....	90
XVII. The Social Reformers .....	95
XVIII. The Advocates of Broader Relationship .....	99
XIX. The Bishops of Methodism Live On .....	106
Appendix .....	109
Index .....	126

## P R E F A C E

This small volume is written at the request of the Council of Bishops of the United Methodist Church, and primarily for them. There is nothing exhaustive about it. It does not contain a series of biographical sketches of those who have constituted the episcopacy of what was formerly known as The Methodist Church. Rather, it attempts a gathering together from many sources certain more or less interesting data regarding these particular bishops, and seeks to afford something of a picture of them as a company. Its purpose is to make available for the present bishops and for United Methodist bishops who may be elected in the future some further understanding of this portion of the episcopal heritage which they share together.

The book confines itself to the bishops elected in the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South between the organizing conference of 1784 and Methodist-Evangelical United Brethren union in 1968. Both the United Brethren Church and the Evangelical Association published volumes containing the biographies of all of their bishops. The story of the bishops of the Evangelical United Brethren Church after the union of 1946 is told in a volume by Bishop Paul Milhouse, only recently published. The story of the bishops of the United Methodist Church elected after May, 1968, belongs to a future work.

In selecting the title, the suggestion of my son, the Reverend Riley Short, of Leesburg, Florida, to use the words of the Ritual for the presentation of bishops to be consecrated, seemed appropriate. The sentence of presentation reads, "We present unto you this elder chosen to be consecrated a bishop."

The episcopal seal appearing on the cover of this book was uniform for all the bishops of The Methodist Church, except, of course, for the name. The triangle containing the bishop's cross symbolizes the Trinity. The date "1739" is the date of Wesley's Aldersgate experience, and the date "1784" is the date of the organizing of the Methodist Church in the United States. The seal also carries the injunction, "Love, Believe, Obey," and the symbol of an open Bible. The outer circle contained the inscription, "The Methodist Church," and the bishop's name.

Roy H. Short

February 1, 1976

# I The Bishops As A Company

The bishops of American Methodism, to be understood fully, must be considered as a company. All of them, of course, were individuals, but no one of them can be considered adequately apart from his episcopal brethren. All of them have always had the same status, enjoyed the same prerogatives, and received like compensation. Together they have administered the entire church under the one body of law adopted by the one General Conference.

Between 1784, when the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States was formally organized, and 1968 when The United Methodist Church was formed, two hundred ninety-three persons were elected and consecrated as bishops of the church. Fourteen were elected by the undivided church prior to 1845. One hundred fourteen were elected in the Methodist Episcopal Church between 1845 and 1939. Fifty-six were elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South between 1845 and 1939. Two were elected by the delegates of the Methodist Protestant Church, which did not have bishops, as these met in special session at the time of the Methodist Uniting Conference in Kansas City in 1939. One hundred seven were elected in The Methodist Church between 1939 and 1968. These two hundred ninety-three persons constitute the company of bishops of that branch of Methodism which was formally organized in Baltimore in 1784 and which merged with the Evangelical United Brethren Church in 1968 to form The United Methodist Church.

During these years seven men were elected bishops but declined the office. Wilbur Fisk was elected in 1828 as bishop for Canada, but declined. He was elected a second time in 1836, while he was in Europe, but again declined. James R. Day, Chancellor of Syracuse University, was elected in 1904, but refused the election. Joshua Soule was elected in 1820, but declined the office because of his objection to the action of that General Conference which made the presiding eldership elective, which he considered an abridgement of the inherent power of the episcopacy. When later this legislation was at first suspended and then abandoned, he accepted a second election in 1824. Atticus G. Haygood was elected in 1882, but declined the office. He was elected a second time in 1890 and accepted the election.

Franklin N. Parker, dean of the Candler School of Theology, was elected in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in 1918, but declined to be consecrated, feeling that he could make his most effective contribution by continuing in the field of ministerial training.

E. Stanley Jones was elected in 1928, but declined the office believing that his call was to be an evangelist rather than a church administrator. His son-in-law, James K. Mathews, was elected a bishop by the Central Conference of Southern Asia but declined, feeling that the place should be filled by a national. Later, in 1960, he was again elected a bishop, this time by the Northeastern Jurisdictional Conference.

The record of a number of other persons who came close to election to the

episcopacy, but failed for some reason to be elected, makes fascinating reading, indeed. Included in this number are some of the mental and spiritual giants of the church, such as Nathan Bangs or John B. McFerrin. One of the most obvious cases is that of Jesse Lee, the founder of Methodism in New England and certainly one of the most effective and widely acknowledged leaders of American Methodism in the days of its beginnings, who failed of election in 1800 by four votes. Richard Whatcoat, a good but a less able man, was elected instead. Just what precisely explains Lee's failure to be elected has been a subject of intriguing interest for Methodist historians ever since.

J. W. E. Bowen, long connected with Gammon Seminary, received a considerable vote in 1896, 1900, 1904, and 1908, but failed to attain the necessary majority. His son, J. W. E. Bowen, Jr., was elected by the Central Jurisdiction in 1948.

Book-length biographies of sixty-four of the bishops of Methodism have appeared from time to time, but the majority have no such monument, and many of them represent necessarily only shadowy characters for most United Methodists today. In 1948, Bishop Frederick D. Leete published a book entitled *Methodist Bishops*, which represented for the most part only a brief and often one paragraph sketch of each bishop, giving certain factual data concerning his career, but the overall story of the Methodist bishops as a company remains to be told. It is a story well worth knowing. Numerous scholarly books and treatises have appeared periodically dealing with the office of the episcopacy in Methodism. The office itself, however, is not the subject of this particular writing. What it attempts rather is simply to tell something of the personal story of the company of individuals who across almost two centuries have occupied the office and to make them come alive, in some measure at least, for United Methodists of our own day.

It was long customary in the churches forming the Evangelical United Brethren Church to publish and distribute the biographies of their bishops. The life story of each of these bishops has been told in fuller detail by those best in position to tell it, than has been the case with the Methodist bishops as a whole. No attempt is made here, therefore, to include the Evangelical and United Brethren bishops who are so important a part of the total United Methodist episcopal heritage.

The names of all the bishops elected in the former Methodist Church and in the Evangelical United Brethren tradition since 1784 appear in the early pages of each edition of the *Discipline*. The bishops in this list represent an assorted company coming out of various backgrounds, nationally, racially and culturally, thus making for a quality of richness in the episcopal heritage that would not be possible otherwise.

Most of the Methodist bishops were native Americans, but many other lands also are represented in the total number. The first three bishops, Coke, Asbury and Whatcoat, were all born in England, as were also Bishops Thomson, Burt, Lowe and Johnson of later days in the life of the church. Bishops Berry, Flint, Fowler, Nicholson, Northcott and Warne were all born in Canada. Bishops

Broomfield, Gowdy and McIntyre were born in Scotland; Bishop Richardson was born in the West Indies, and Bishop J. E. Robinson in Ireland. Thus no inconsiderable number of the company of Methodist bishops were born on the soil of the Empire that gave original Methodism to the world.

Seven sons of India were elected to the Methodist episcopacy — Bishops Chitambar, Mondol, Subhan, Singh, Sundaram, Balaram and Shaw — as were likewise three sons of China — Bishops Wong Chih Ping, Chen, and Kaung. The Philippines furnished Bishops Alejandro, Valencia, and Guansing.

A number of sons of missionary parents, born on shores foreign to their native land, have been elected to the episcopacy. This was true of Bishops Lambuth and Lacy in China, Badley and Rockey in India, and Nuelsen in Switzerland.

Bishops Arvidson, Hagen, Bast, Andreassen, Barbieri, Gattinoni, Melle, J. W. E. Sommer, Wunderlich, Sigg and Schäfer were all born on European soil. Latin America was the birthplace of Bishops Balloch, Elphick, Sabanes and Zottele. Native Africans elected include Bishops Shungu, Nagbe and Zunguze.

This wide diversity of birthplace and cultural heritage speaks volumes concerning the desire of Methodism as a world church to have an episcopacy truly representative of the total church throughout the world.

Of the American-born bishops, the largest number have come from Ohio, which has seen twenty-nine of its native sons elected. Next in order are New York with twenty and Virginia with sixteen.

Fifteen of the American-born bishops were born in New England; forty-two in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; twelve in Delaware and Maryland; forty-eight in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin; twenty-four in the border states of West Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri; seventy-one in the states of the old South; nine in the upper states west of the Mississippi; fifteen in Texas and the southwest; and two in the far west. It is interesting to note that Bishops Soule and Linus Parker of the Southern Church were born in Maine and New York respectively, while Bishop Vincent of the church in the North was born in Alabama in the deep South. Bishop Grant of the Western Jurisdiction was also born in Alabama.

Twenty-one black Americans were elected bishop prior to 1968; namely, Francis Burns, J. W. Roberts, I. B. Scott, Camphor, Clair, Sr., R. E. Jones, Shaw, W. A. C. Hughes, L. H. King, Brooks, Kelly, W. J. King, Bowen, Clair, Jr., Love, Prince Taylor, Golden, Noah Moore, M. L. Harris, Thomas, and Allen.

At least one native son was elected to the episcopacy in Methodism prior to the formation of the United Methodist Church from each of the states east of the Mississippi River except Rhode Island and Florida, and from each state west of the river except Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Hawaii and Alaska.

The bishops have been as diverse in their training, their skills, their gifts, their theological and social viewpoints, their outlook, their methods of operation and their major concerns regarding the church as they have been in their

national, racial and cultural backgrounds. Yet, while each has been disposed to be himself, and has been free so to be, at the same time they have generally been able to labor together effectively and to give to the church a general superintendency characterized by an essential unity of purpose.

The American bishops elected at the youngest age include Bishops Galloway elected at thirty-six, Janes at thirty-seven, R. R. Roberts and Andrew at thirty-eight, and Asbury, Soule and Hendrix at thirty-nine. Bishop Nagbe of Liberia was elected at thirty-two.

The bishops elected at the oldest age include Bishops Whatcoat elected at sixty, Peck at sixty-one, Neely at sixty-three, and Charles W. Smith and Hartman at sixty-eight. Bishop Early, also elected at sixty-eight, had already been a preacher for fifty years.

A few of the bishops saw very short terms of service. Bishop W. A. C. Hughes, elected by the Central Jurisdiction in 1940, was quite ill at the time of election and died twenty-two days following his consecration. Bishop Bascom, elected in May of 1850, died in September of the same year after holding only one Annual Conference, the St. Louis. Bishop Tigert, elected in 1906, died while holding his second conference, the Indian Mission, as a result of choking on a chicken bone. Bishop E. W. Parker, elected for service in India, Bishop B. Foster Stockwell, elected in Latin America, and Bishop E. O. Haven, all lived only about a year following their election.

Bishop Franklin Hamilton died the second year after election, while Bishops Emory, Camphor, Garth, Linus Parker, Seth Ward, Balaran and Coke Smith died during the third year. A unique happening in Methodist episcopal history is the fact that all three of the bishops elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1864, Bishops Thomson, Kingsley and Clark, died during their second quadrennium of service, as did also Bishop Hodge.

On the other hand, certain other bishops had long years of membership in the episcopal body. The record was set by Bishop Herbert Welch, who was elected in 1916 and completed fifty-three years as a member of the Council of Bishops, passing away at the age of one hundred six in 1969. Other bishops having long years of membership in the Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the College of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South or the Council of Bishops of The Methodist Church, were Bishops R. E. Jones and Boaz with forty years each, McConnell and Hendrix with forty-one years each, Edwin Holt Hughes with forty-two years, Soule and Candler with forty-three years each, Arthur J. Moore with forty-four years, Leete with forty-six years, and Thomas Bowman with forty-eight years. Bishop Bowman died at age ninety-seven, after serving as senior bishop for thirty years.

For long years Methodism had no set retirement age for bishops, as it also had no set retirement age for members of conference. At first the church dealt with the problem of advancing age and growing incapacity to travel by assigning the bishop concerned only one or two conferences, and sometimes designating a younger colleague to attend his conferences with him. This arrangement often proved taxing for the aging bishop and sometimes difficult for the conferences

affected, but it was followed for a lengthy period of time. Some bishops, realizing that the years were taking their toll, did ask for retirement, but often this was at a late age and when the health of the bishop had obviously broken seriously. Bishop Early asked for such retirement at eighty, as did also Bishop Keener. Bishop Key retired at eighty-one and Bishop Paine at eighty-three.

But there were other aging bishops who refused to face growing incapacity, and in those cases the General Conference found itself under the necessity of forcing retirement. Some of the sad chapters of Methodist General Conference history come at this particular point.

The 1904 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church took action to retire six aging bishops at one time, including Bishops Merrill and E. G. Andrews who were seventy-nine, Mallalieu who was seventy-six, Walden who was seventy-three, Vincent who was seventy-two, and Foss who was seventy-one. Some of these were among the strongest and most highly regarded bishops the church had ever had. Most of them were expecting to continue active, and in some cases were very much hurt by the action of the conference.

Likewise, the 1912 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church found itself forcing the retirement of Bishop Neely, to which he strongly objected, and he carried to the conference floor his protest, which went unheard. By the same conference, Bishops Cranston, David Moore and Warren were also retired. Bishop Warren was one of the most loved bishops of the church. He was eighty-one at the time. The action took him by surprise, as he fully expected to go on. He lived only a few months after retirement.

The 1914 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by ballot vote, retired the venerable and greatly respected Bishop A. W. Wilson, who was eighty years of age and who had served as a bishop for thirty-two years. He apparently was as alert as ever in mind but was feeble in body. Nevertheless, he was sure he could go on.

At long length Methodism did fix a retirement age for bishops, so that in the future such embarrassment relative to concluding the active services of its episcopal leaders might be avoided. The Methodist Episcopal Church, after trying to deal with retirements individually, adopted an automatic retirement age in 1912, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South did so in 1934. Similar provision was written into the law of The Methodist Church at the time of union in 1939.

Some bishops, it must be admitted, have found retirement hard to take after being busy and in the forefront of the church's activities for so long. Bishop Hoss, for instance, was retired by the 1918 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Despite failing health, he was deeply hurt and felt that his church was rejecting him. This is the more understandable when we remember the prominent role he had played for a dozen years previous in the Vanderbilt controversy. He accepted, without a word, the judgment that retired him. The few years that followed were lonely years, however, and he complained that he did not hear even from his episcopal colleagues, except Bishop Denny. Bishop Hendrix found the inactivity of retirement, and being immobilized by

illness, difficult, as did also Bishop Oxnam.

Automatic retirement does not mean that the church no longer has use for the services of older bishops, so long as they remain in good health and have some possible contribution to make, but simply that they are, in ancient Methodist language, "released from the obligation to travel." Whatever service they render following retirement is on a voluntary basis.

Some retired bishops have been called back into temporary active service to take the place of an active bishop who has died. Following retirement, Bishops Welch and Lowe gave significant leadership to the Methodist Committee on Overseas Relief, and Bishop Hammaker to the Board of Temperance. Some retired bishops, such as Ledden, William C. Martin, Paul Martin, Pope, Harrell, Harmon, Garrison and J. O. Smith, have been asked to teach courses in seminaries; some, such as Bishops Raines, Pryor, Dodge, Henley, Garber, Wicke, Lord and Short, have been given special project assignments by the Council of Bishops; some, such as Bishops Noah Moore and Galloway, have done work for some of the boards and agencies of the church; and some have been used largely by local churches as evangelists and missionaries. Bishop Nall, following retirement, cared for the work in Hong Kong-Taiwan for a period, and Bishops Rockey and Amstutz did the same in Pakistan, and Bishop Mondol in the Philippines. Bishop Voigt, after retiring, served for a while as a college president, and Bishop Holloway taught in a college.

A few of the bishops have resigned the office. The first to do this was Bishop Hamline, who was elected in 1844 and resigned in 1852. He resigned as a matter of conviction. In the General Conference of 1844, which divided the church, he had been a floor leader in the debates. As over against those like Bishop Soule, who saw the episcopacy as a special order with certain peculiar prerogatives of its own, Hamline saw it simply as an elective office subject to whatever the General Conference chose to do with it. True to his convictions regarding the office, he chose to lay it aside after eight years of service and to join the ranks of the retired brethren of his former conference, continuing thus until his death years later.

Bishop Frederick B. Fisher, after ten years of service in India, resigned the office in 1930 to return to the pastorate, becoming the pastor of Central Church, Detroit. Bishop Grose resigned in 1932. Bishop Wang resigned in 1937.

In 1928, Bishop Anton Bast of Denmark, under pressure of certain charges in both state and church courts, was suspended from exercising the office of a bishop and shortly thereafter withdrew from the ministry and membership of the church.

While only four of the bishops of Methodism ever resigned, a number of them under the stress and strain of the office have been at times tempted to resign. Bishop Morris wrote out a formal resignation and carried it to the General Conference of 1840. A copy of it is still extant. In it he affirms that he had reached the conclusion that he was by talent and temperament unfitted for the office. He was persuaded to withhold the resignation and gave thereafter twenty-four years of active service.

Bishops Arthur Moore, Frank Smith and Paul Kern were all elected together in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in 1930. Bishop Moore had been a professional evangelist and Bishop Kern a teacher, but Bishop Smith had never been anything except a pastor. The depression was on, the bishops were under attack, and in 1934 the three young bishops conferred together concerning resigning. Bishops Moore and Kern were somewhat favorable to the idea, but Bishop Smith said, "If we resign, Arthur can evangelize and Paul can teach, but I can't do anything but go back to a pastorate, and there's no telling what kind of church they would give me. I am going to hold on."

The Annual Conference connections of the various bishops is a matter of more than passing interest. The conferences from which many of the bishops of the yesteryears were elected have long since passed away. Of the present conferences and their predecessor conferences, all except seven or eight are represented by the election at one time or another of at least one person from their ranks prior to 1968.

Normally, no more than one person has been elected from any one conference in a given year, but this tradition was broken in 1852 when Bishops Simpson and Ames were both elected from the Indiana Conference; in 1938, when Bishops Selecman and William C. Martin were both elected from the North Texas Conference, and again in 1944, when Bishops W. Angie Smith and Paul E. Martin, also from the North Texas Conference, were elected; and in 1948, when Bishops Phillips and Tippett were elected from the Southern California-Arizona Conference. Bishops Golden and Harris were both elected from the Lexington Conference in 1960.

It is now generally thought that a person's chances of election to the episcopacy are enhanced if one is a member of the General Conference or Jurisdictional Conference delegation, and still more so if one leads the delegation. Some persons have been elected bishops, however, who were not even in the delegation. This was the case with Bishop Waugh in 1836, Bishop Janes in 1844, and Bishop Hargrove in 1882. Bishop Marvin was not even at the seat of the conference when he was elected in 1866 on the first ballot. Bishop Haygood was in St. Louis, the seat of the General Conference of 1890, but he went fishing the day of the election and was not present when the vote was announced.

The traditional Methodist term used in earlier years in calling for the election of new bishops was the rather strange term, "strengthen the episcopacy." It carried no more than the idea that the time had come when some younger persons needed to be added to the episcopal body, so that the strength of the total episcopal team might be maintained. Most general and jurisdictional conferences have elected at least one bishop. Such elections were passed by, however, in the 1804, 1812, 1828, and 1840 General Conferences of the undivided church. The 1820 General Conference elected Joshua Soule, but when he declined consecration it did not proceed to elect anyone else.

The 1848, 1856, 1860, 1868, 1876, and 1892 General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church did not see fit to elect any new bishops. This was the case also with the 1858, 1874, 1878, 1894, 1914, and 1934 General Conferences

of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The decision of the 1858 conference of the Church South not to elect at least one new bishop proved most costly, insofar as the General Conference scheduled for 1862 could not meet because of the Civil War, and the church had to pass through a lengthy and extremely critical period with a small number of episcopal leaders, half of whom were suffering from the infirmities of age. The General Conference of 1866, therefore, found it necessary to elect four new bishops, all of whom proved so effective in leadership that they became largely the salvation of the Methodist Church in the Southland during the tragic and extremely difficult Reconstruction period.

In the undivided church prior to and including 1844, the average number of bishops elected per General Conference was one. In the Methodist Episcopal Church from 1848 to 1936 the average number of bishops elected per General Conference was better than four. The largest number of bishops to be elected at one time was fourteen, elected by the 1920 General Conference. Eleven bishops were elected by the 1904 General Conference, and ten by that of 1912.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church, South the average number of bishops elected per General Conference was two. The largest number of bishops to be elected in the Southern Church at one time was seven. This happened twice, first at the General Conference of 1910 and again in 1938, the last General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

The overwhelming majority of the two hundred ninety-three bishops of Methodism have long since finished their course. Their graves are scattered over the very globe itself. Bishops Kingsley, Wiley, Burns, John W. Roberts, John E. Robinson, M. C. Harris, Lambuth and John W. Robinson were all buried overseas from their native shores where death found them at their labors. Bishop Coke died on shipboard and was buried at sea in the Indian Ocean.

Mount Olivet Cemetery in Baltimore is particularly sacred ground for Methodists, for there Bishops Asbury, George, Emory and Waugh, great leaders of the church in its beginning days, are all buried. The same is true of the little cemetery at old Oxford in Georgia, where the graves of Bishops Andrew, Candler and Haygood are to be found.

Rose Hill Cemetery in Chicago is the final resting place of Bishops Hamline, W. L. Harris, Merrill and McCabe. Bishops McKendree, Soule and McTyeire are all interred in a small lot on the campus of Vanderbilt University in Nashville. Bishop Roberts, the pioneer bishop, was first buried in a field on his remote Indiana farm and later his remains were removed to the campus of DePauw University at Greencastle, Indiana. The ashes of Bishop Oxnam are interred in the chapel of Wesley Seminary in Washington.

Most of the other deceased bishops have their final resting place in the soil of the state which gave them birth, or of the state which was the scene of their latest labors.

## II

# The Election of Bishops

A single answer cannot be given to the question, "What is it that has elected persons as bishops in Methodism?" Neither can the answer be determined simply by examining the journal record of the voting in the respective General and Jurisdictional Conferences. If one would know the whole story, one must read between the lines and search for hidden explanations of a steady climb or sudden drop in the voting for a person under consideration or the quick emergence of new names in the balloting. The truth of the matter is that were all the facts known, it would be found that there is a different story behind almost every episcopal election and that several factors have entered into each picture.

Perhaps the most common assertion made with reference to episcopal elections is that the bishops have elected the bishops. There is only a measure of truth in this. It has long been assumed by some that in the first episcopal election in 1800, Asbury adroitly threw the weight of his influence in the direction of Richard Whatcoat, but there are those who deny this, and Jesse Lee, the other man who came so close to election, in his subsequent writings shows no bitterness toward either Asbury or Whatcoat. It is also sometimes concluded that Asbury brought about the election of McKendree in 1808. The voting in this election was not so close, however, as in 1800. Beyond question, Asbury did have great admiration for McKendree, for he had seen his leadership qualities tested in the new, far-reaching and difficult Western Conference and had had some opportunity to observe him closely during the time McKendree acted as his traveling companion. Bishop McTyeire, of the Church South, was an unusually strong and dominating personality, and it is sometimes claimed that no persons were elected bishops in the Southern Church between his own election in 1866 and his death in 1889 who did not have the stamp of his approval.

Bishop Simpson carried much the same weight in the Methodist Episcopal Church during the same approximate period. In a later period, Bishop Berry was often spoken of as a kingmaker; however, there are those who claim that he did little more than dabble at kingmaking, but liked to give the impression that he had more political power than he actually had. To deny that some bishops at times have wanted to see certain persons elected to the episcopacy and have quietly done what they could to see them elected would be to deny facts, but the bishops as a company have not considered the elections a proper agenda item for them to consider in council, nor have they as a body sought to determine election outcomes. The probability is that in an earlier time the bishops carried greater weight in episcopal elections than they have for some years now. In fact, today the known endorsement of a bishop or bishops can easily prove the kiss of death for some aspirant who had decided with Paul that "he that desires the office of a bishop desireth a good work" (I Timothy 3:1).

When William McKendree was elected in 1808, it was after he had preached before the General Conference a profoundly moving sermon concerning which Bishop Asbury remarked, "That sermon will make him a bishop."

There are those who ask themselves whether it was the sermon itself or the complimentary remark of the bishop which most affected the election. Beyond doubt, powerful sermons have sometimes had their effect in the election of men to the episcopacy, but not necessarily sermons preached at the actual time of the electing conference. In fact, there have been occasions when men being considered for the episcopacy have preached at General Conference and being under undue pressure have not been up to their preaching best, and have, therefore, lost rather than gained votes. In addition, deep resentment at the program committee's giving to one individual what appears an advantage over others under consideration has also sometimes proved costly to the person concerned.

Floor leadership and committee leadership taken at General or Jurisdictional Conference have probably done far more to spot particular persons for election than have sermons preached at the same conferences. All General and Jurisdictional Conferences witness the emergence of certain floor leaders who constantly enter into the debates, make motions and resort to parliamentary maneuvers, and thus have strong effect upon the proceedings of the conference. In the present day a number of the most visible floor leaders at General Conference are lay persons, but in an earlier day they were largely clerical and often these were elected to the episcopacy. This was not always the case, however. James M. Buckley, for instance, was for forty years, from 1876 to 1916, a strong voice and a floor leader in the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but he was never elected bishop. The same was true of J. B. McFerrin, so long a dominant figure in the General Conferences of the Church South, or T. D. Ellis of the South Georgia Conference of the same church in a little later day. Beginning with the establishment of the delegated General Conferences in 1808, the bishops were denied the privilege of making motions or speaking in the General Conference. There are now those who feel that too much possible contribution to greatly needed floor leadership is now immobilized by election to the episcopacy, and that it is the church which loses when a person like Paul B. Kern, elected in 1930, or G. Bromley Oxnam, elected in 1936, can no longer enter freely into the floor processes by which General Conferences arrive at decisions.

Some persons have been elected to the episcopacy as a result of their carrying a banner. This is not to suggest that the banner-carrying was for the purpose of election, but rather that as a result of championing a cause the individual concerned won the attention of the church. Bishop McTyeire, for instance, in 1866 won considerable attention by supporting lay representation in the General and Annual Conferences; Bishop Leete captured attention in 1912 by his concern for lay brotherhoods and an active lay program; Bishop Keeney in 1920 by his sponsoring of the Million Unit Fellowship which was something of a modern adaptation of the ancient Methodist class; Bishop Welch in 1916 by his advocacy of the application of the Gospel to social life; Bishop Kern in 1930 by his efforts to establish a unified educational program in the Church South; and Bishop Cushman in 1932 by his leadership in the field of stewardship. The

names of still other bishops who have carried other banners could easily be added to such a list.

Over a long period of time in Methodism, holding connectional office seemed to be the most promising way into the episcopacy. This was especially true prior to 1939. Naturally, connectional positions led to the persons holding them becoming widely known and thus spotted for consideration. Bishops Emory, Waugh, Levi Scott, Walden, and Cranston were Publishing Agents when elected, as was also Bishop Early. Bishops W. L. Harris, Fowler, J. N. Fitzgerald, McCabe, Stuntz, Oldham, Fisher and Lowe were Missionary Secretaries, as were also Bishops Wilson, Morrison, Seth Ward, Lambuth, John M. Moore, and Beauchamp of the Church South. Bishop McMurry was a Church Extension Secretary. Bishops Goodsell, Vincent, McDowell, Anderson, Neely, Nicholson and Blake were Secretaries of Education, as was also Bishop Atkins of the Church South. Bishops J. W. Hamilton and Hartzell were Secretaries of the Freedmen's Aid Society. Bishop Cooke was Book Editor.

Since Methodist Union in 1939, with the transfer of episcopal elections to the Jurisdictional Conferences, the number of connectional men elected has dropped sharply. Those elected from connectional agencies in this period have been Bishops W. A. C. Hughes, Brooks, Bowen, Love, Harmon, Taylor, Golden, Mathews, Middleton, Nall, Thomas, Allen and Short.

By and large, no position seems to have enhanced one's chance of election more than holding an editorship, particularly in the earlier years. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, fifteen editors were elected. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, seven bishops were elected who were editors at the time of their election and several others who had been editors in earlier years. In The Methodist Church, between 1939 and 1968, seven editors were elected.

In 1864, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, all three persons elected were editors — Bishops Clark, Kingsley and Thomson. They were "war editors" and they kept their papers battling for the cause of the Union, which fact undoubtedly spotted them for election.

In the Church South at one period, having been editor of the *New Orleans Christian Advocate* seemed to carry great weight. Bishops McTyeire, Keener and Linus Parker, editors in turn of this once popular paper, were all elected. Bishop Galloway was also once editor of the same paper.

Of particular interest is the fact that almost all the editors of the *Southwestern Christian Advocate*, and its successor, the *Central Christian Advocate*, long serving the Negro conferences and churches, have been elected bishops. These include Bishops Hartzell, I. B. Scott, R. E. Jones, Shaw, L. H. King, Brooks, Bowen, Taylor and Allen.

Holding positions connected with colleges and seminaries has also spotted a number of persons for consideration for election. In the Methodist Episcopal Church twenty men were elected bishop who held school positions of some kind at the time of their election, while in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, sixteen such persons were elected. The election of 1910 in the Southern Church is particularly interesting at this point. At that time seven bishops were elected, six

of whom were school men: Denny from Vanderbilt, Mouzon from Southwestern, Kilgo from Trinity, Murrah from Millsaps, McCoy from Birmingham College, and Waterhouse from Emory and Henry. In The Methodist Church between 1939 and 1968, eleven men coming out of the school world were elected. In recent years, with almost all the ministerial members of Jurisdictional Conferences being seminary graduates, seminary alumni voting has sometimes had no inconsiderable effect upon the final result. Of late there has been some undercurrent of opinion that not more than one school person should be elected in any one jurisdiction at the same time, which apparently has had some effect in the voting.

In the beginning days of Methodism in the United States, of the first nine bishops elected, six were presiding elders. After 1832 this pattern appears to change, and thereafter in the Methodist Episcopal Church only Bishops Ames, Mallalieu, Bickley, Luther Wilson, Shepard, Clair, Sr. and Miller were presiding elders or district superintendents at the time of election, whereas in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South this was true only of Bishop Hargrove. A number of the missionary bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church were presiding elders at the time of their election. In The Methodist Church no person chosen was a district superintendent at the time of election.

Prior to the division of the church in 1844, only Bishop Soule was a pastor at the time of election. Of the bishops elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church between 1844 and 1939, twenty-five were pastors at the time of election, and in the Church South twelve came directly from the pastorate.

Beginning in 1939, with the adoption of the jurisdictional system, and continuing until 1968, the number of pastors elected jumped sharply. Forty-six pastors were elected in this period as over against eleven school persons, eight editors, nine connectional men and two area executives.

Prominent and active laymen and laywomen have had far more to do with the outcome of episcopal elections since 1866 than is often realized. Back of the election of more than one bishop, when the whole story is known, is the figure of some devoted, enthusiastic and active lay friend. Sometimes these friends have proved quite clever. Such a friend in one long ago election, when an unusually large number of bishops were to be elected, is said to have buttonholed the General Conference delegates, saying, "My preacher friend hasn't a chance to be elected, but when you are voting for so many, I wonder if you would mind giving him a complimentary vote." How much this strategy accounted for the brother's election will actually never be known, but there were those who believed that it had large effect.

Again, group pressures have sometimes influenced elections, anticipating the methods of present-day caucuses. In the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1908, Bishop Nuelson, who made a truly great bishop, was elected largely as a result of the insistence of the then large German constituency of the church that it should be represented in the episcopacy. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, when in 1886 the holiness movement was running at high tide, Bishop Joseph S. Key was elected largely as a result of the pressures of the holiness

group. Bishop Sam R. Hay, elected in 1922, who had a certain roughness about him and who was a great humorist, used to explain his own election with a twinkle in his eye by saying, "The rougher element rose up and demanded to be recognized." The foregoing are only a few examples which could be multiplied considerably by close study of the long history of episcopal elections.

No inconsiderable number of bishops have been elected as the result of a ground swell of interest in them, obtaining widely throughout the church. This was true of Bishop Marvin in 1866, of Bishop Hendrix in 1886, of Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes in 1908, of Bishop McConnell in 1912, and of a number of other bishops who might be named.

It would be less than honest not to acknowledge that the trading of votes has sometimes entered into episcopal elections, and conferences which have wanted to see favorite sons elected have at times bargained with other conferences which likewise had their favorites. Even fraternal connections have sometimes had at least some measure of influence in the voting.

In the church prior to 1844, there was often an attempt by gentlemen's agreement to keep some sectional balance. Thus in the election of 1832, John Emory was elected to represent the Northern section of the church and James O. Andrew the Southern. At first the votes for Southern recognition were going to William Capers, but it became apparent that he could not be elected because he was a slave-holder and he withdrew in favor of Andrew. Twelve years later Andrew became involved in slavery through marriage and by a bequest.

A unique episcopal election was that of William Taylor, elected in 1884 as missionary bishop for Africa. At the time he was a lay delegate to the General Conference. He was, however, an ordained local preacher and thus met the requirement that a bishop must be an ordained elder. He had in earlier years been a regular member of conference but had located in order to be free to evangelize and to conduct his independent missions. Some of the authorities of the church looked with disfavor upon his possible election, regarding him as too much of a free lance. The determined and organized support of a large company of admirers elected him, however, though at the time he was already sixty-three years of age.

In the 1836 General Conference Bishop Morris came within one vote of election on the first ballot and on the fifth, and was elected on the sixth ballot. He wrote, "It was twice within my power to elect myself, but I voted for other candidates."

In the General Conference of 1844, on the second ballot, a larger number of votes were cast than there were delegates. At this conference, on the third ballot, Bishop Janes was elected largely with Southern support and was presented for consecration by Doctors Capers and Pierce, both Southerners, but when the division came he chose to remain with the Methodist Episcopal Church. On the same third ballot Bishop Hamline was also elected, apparently with some exchange of Northern and Southern support. In 1898, in the Church South, by a strange coincidence three persons received a majority, the low one of the three being E. E. Hoss. There was a proposal to lift the number elected to three, but

Hoss himself strongly opposed the proposal. Four years later he was elected by a large vote on the first ballot. In 1932 a strange coincidence occurred in the Methodist Episcopal General Conference. The country was deep in the depression, and the election of only two bishops was ordered. Both of those elected had the same given name — J. Ralph Magee and Ralph S. Cushman.

In 1918, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the General Conference had ordered the election of six bishops and six were elected, including Franklin N. Parker of Emory University. Parker let it be known that he could not accept the election and that he was under the necessity of declining to be consecrated. The runner-up in the voting was James Cannon, Jr., of Virginia. Apparently at least some of the bishops were not favorable to his election and the College of Bishops decided that Bishop Kilgo, who was to be in the chair, would rule that the election of six bishops had been ordered, that six had been elected, and that therefore the matter was closed. This decision was out of line with the position taken by the Southern General Conference in 1882, which had ordered the election of four bishops. At that time Atticus Haygood was elected but declined the office, and the conference proceeded to another election. The decision of the chair was reversed by the 1918 General Conference, and the conference proceeded to elect Bishop Cannon.

In the 1965 session of the Philippines Central Conference fifty-two ballots were cast without securing an election. Two years later Bishop Benjamin Guansing was elected on the eighth ballot.

Seeking to achieve the necessary fraction has on numerous occasions resulted in a hopeless deadlock, and matters have been resolved by the introduction of the name of some highly regarded person on whom all parties could find some measure of agreement but who had only a small number of votes in the initial balloting. Some of the most effective bishops in the church have been among those chosen in an effort to break a deadlock between other strong candidates.

Election to the episcopacy was by simple majority vote at first, but later it became the pattern to require from sixty percent to a two-thirds majority of those present and voting to elect. It is interesting to note that a considerable number of those who have failed to be elected because of failing to reach the designated majority would have been elected under the original practice which called for receiving only a simple majority of the votes cast. The lengthiest General Conference election was that of the 1912 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which required twenty-eight ballots occupying nine full days and resulted in the election of eight bishops.

Some of the strongest bishops the church has had were elected only after lengthened balloting. Bishop Hughes, for instance, was elected on the fifteenth ballot after six days of voting, and Bishop McConnell was elected on the twenty-first ballot.

A few of the bishops came close to election at one General Conference but were elected at a later General Conference. Bishop Capers withdrew in 1832 in favor of Bishop Andrew and was later elected by the M. E. Church, South in

1846. Bishop E. O. Haven came close to election in 1872, but failed to achieve the necessary number of votes. There was no election in the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1876. Bishop Haven was then elected in 1880. Bishop Wightman came within one vote of election in 1854 in the Church South. There was no election in 1858 and the General Conference scheduled for 1862 could not meet because of the war. He was elected on the first ballot in 1866, after a twelve-year wait. Bishop Tigert, likewise, was high in the consideration of the 1902 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, but failed of election. He was then elected at the next General Conference of 1906. Some bishops elected have had almost no vote on the starting ballots. Such was the case with Bishop Atkins, elected in 1906, who had only a negligible vote on the first ballot, and the same was true of Bishop Garber elected in 1944.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1920, Bishop Mead was elected from a pastorate in Denver and was assigned to the Denver Area. Of the bishops of The Methodist Church, Bishops Hartman, Newell, Wicke, Werner, Nall, Reed, Alton and Branscomb had their first episcopal assignment to the areas from which they were elected. Bishops Stuart, Ensley, Holt, Selecman, William C. Martin, Frank Smith, Decell, Purcell, Gum and Short subsequently were assigned to the areas from which they were elected. Bishop Booth was elected originally for service in Africa but later was assigned to the Harrisburg Area in the Northeastern Jurisdiction. Bishop Willis King was elected by the Central Jurisdiction for service in Liberia and later was assigned to the New Orleans Area of the Central Jurisdiction. Bishop Prince Taylor, likewise assigned first to Liberia, was later returned to the United States and assigned to the New Jersey Area. Bishop Garber, when first elected, was assigned to the Geneva Area but was later returned to the states and assigned to the Richmond Area.

How various men have reacted to their election has probably differed with each case. Some have been overwhelmed and have even broken into tears. A few have scarcely been able to hide their satisfaction. Others have been apparently unmoved one way or the other so far as one could tell from appearances. It is said that when Bishop Cannon's election came, he was in the midst of making a speech as a delegate. The speech was interrupted to announce the election and following the announcement, Cannon said, "Now as I was saying," and proceeded with his argument.

One of the most interesting reactions was that of Bishop Whatcoat, elected in 1800. Apparently he was little impressed by his own election, and later in writing about the General Conference, he said, "The chief glory of the conference was that over two hundred persons were converted."

It is of some interest to look at the way the earlier years of some of the men elected to the episcopacy were spent. Bishops Emory, A. W. Wilson, Capers and Bowman in early life all studied law. Bishops Wiley, Lambuth, Thomson and Luther B. Wilson were medical doctors. Bishop Keener was a druggist for three years. Bishop Clark in early life was the founder of a life insurance company, and Bishop Peck was a blacksmith. Bishop Bascom was a pump-maker; Bishop Levi Scott was a tanner; and Bishop McIntyre was a bricklayer and all his life

kept a trowel upon his desk to remind him of his beginning occupation. Bishop O. C. Baker served only one year as a pastor, the shortest term in the pastorate served by any bishop. The rest of his earlier career was devoted to teaching.

Bishops Gilbert Haven, Marvin, McCabe, Hargrove, Haygood, Morrison and Granbery were all chaplains during the Civil War. Bishop Granbery lost an eye in combat. Bishops Purcell, Love, Clair, Jr., Paul Martin and Harmon all were chaplains in World War I, while Bishops Lambuth, Selecman and Mead saw service with troops overseas in other ways.

Some local churches have seen several of their former pastors elected to the episcopacy. Smithfield Street Church, Pittsburgh, is represented by Bishops Bascom, Simpson, Charles W. Smith, Mitchell, Locke and Luccock. First Church, Dallas, is represented by Bishops John Moore, Hay, Selecman, William C. Martin, Angie Smith and later Goodrich in the United Methodist Church. McKendree Church, Nashville, is represented by Bishops Paine, Hargrove, Candler, Denny and Lambuth. Travis Park, San Antonio, is represented by Bishops John Moore, Arthur Moore, Mouzon, Kern and Copeland. First Church, Houston, is represented by Bishops DuBose, Seth Ward, Hay, Frank Smith and Pope. Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, is represented by Bishops Mitchell, Burns, Raines and Loder. Washington Street, Columbia, is represented by Bishops Capers, Andrew, Coke Smith and J. O. Smith.

First Church, Los Angeles, numbers among its former pastors Bishops McIntyre, Locke and Tippett; First Church, Birmingham, Bishops Arthur Moore, Angie Smith and Hardin; Highlands, Birmingham, Bishops McCoy, Dobbs and Franklin; First Church, Little Rock, Bishops Watts, William C. Martin and Walton; Centenary, St. Louis, Bishops Marvin, McMurry and Hay; and Boston Avenue, Tulsa, Bishop Paul Galloway and later Bishop Crutchfield, elected in the United Methodist Church.

Laurel Heights, San Antonio, once had as pastor Bishops Frank Smith and Watts; First Church, Charlotte, Bishops Peele and Goodson; First Church, Orlando, Bishops Branscomb, Pendergrass and later Blackburn, elected in the United Methodist Church; Mt. Lebanon, Pittsburgh, Bishops Wicke and Ralph Ward; West End, Nashville, Bishops Harrell and Henley; and Marcus Lindsey, Louisville, Bishops Morrison and Short.

### III

## The Bishops As A Functioning Body

The episcopacy in Methodism has always been a joint general superintendency and the bishops as a company have been charged with administering the whole church. This was simple when there were only two bishops. Bishops Asbury and Whatcoat, after the latter's election in 1800, made all the conferences together and often traveled together at other times. Being in each other's company with fair frequency made it easy to confer as necessity required. After Bishop Whatcoat's death and following the election of Bishop McKendree in 1808, Asbury and McKendree followed much the same pattern until Asbury's death in 1816.

With the election of Bishops Roberts and George in 1816, there were three bishops and they began to divide the work among themselves. Traveling together was not as frequent and opportunities for conference were limited. By 1824 there were five bishops, four of whom were active, and seventeen annual conferences to supervise. The General Conference of that year recommended by formal action that the bishops divide the conferences among themselves and meet annually in Council in order to exercise their general superintendency of the church.

The first assembling of the bishops under this recommendation of the General Conference was held in Philadelphia in April 1826, and may properly be thought of as the first meeting of what is now the Council of Bishops. The bishops met in McKendree's room, and he as the senior bishop apparently both presided and acted as secretary. He made a small, unbound book in which he wrote his notes concerning the meeting. He bound with this handmade notebook several letters which passed between the bishops, and he entitled the lot "The Official Interviews of the Bishops in Philadelphia, April 1826." This priceless record was a part of the McKendree papers long located at Vanderbilt.

Two sessions of the meeting were held, one on the afternoon of April 13 and the other at six o'clock in the morning of April 18. Bishops George and Hedding were holding the Philadelphia Conference at the time, and Bishops Soule and McKendree came from the South. Bishop Roberts was absent. The first meeting, according to Bishop McKendree's notes, lasted about forty-five minutes; Bishop George insisted that he was in a hurry to get to other matters. The second meeting was held later at six in the morning at the insistence of Bishop George. Again, George insisted that he must get away and the meeting lasted about an hour. Two questions in the main were discussed at this meeting, the appointment of a delegate to the British Conference and the assignment of the bishops to hold the next conference sessions. On both matters the four bishops divided sharply. Bishop McKendree, in concluding his notes upon this first meeting of the bishops, writes that in his judgment the meeting did not accomplish "a laudable design." The following year all of the bishops met, but again the four who were present the year before divided as previously.

Thus, the first meeting of the bishops became something of a forecast of other meetings of Methodist bishops in the long years ahead, with some present but others necessarily absent; with some in a hurry to be away to give attention to other things; with marked differences of opinion; and with some feeling at times that not too much was actually accomplished by a particular session together.

Up until 1939 there was no official depository for the minutes of the meetings of the bishops and only scattered fragments are known to exist here and there among the remaining papers of those who acted as secretary or those who made personal memoranda regarding the proceedings.

Those known to have served as Secretary of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church are Bishops W. L. Harris, Andrews, Walden, Burt, Richardson and H. Lester Smith. Those known to have served as Secretary of the College of Bishops of the Church South are Bishops McTyeire, Hargrove, Candler, Denny and John M. Moore. Beginning with the sixteen years of service by Bishop Oxnam as Secretary of the Council of Bishops of The Methodist Church, and continuing through the sixteen years of Bishop Short, the minutes were bound and placed with other pertinent episcopal records in a depository authorized by the Council.

It was the custom for long years in both the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South for the senior bishop, whether active or retired, to preside in the meetings of the bishops. Later in the Methodist Episcopal Church the bishops, both active and retired, presided in the order of election. The seniors in the one church before division in 1844 were Asbury (1784-1816), McKendree (1816-1835), Roberts (1835-1843), and Soule from 1843 to his identification with the M. E. Church, South at its organizing convention in 1845. The seniors in the M. E. Church were Hedding (1845-1852), Waugh (1852-1858), Morris (1858-1874), Janes (1874-1876), Levi Scott (1876-1882), Simpson (1882-1884), Bowman (1884-1914), Vincent (1914-1920), Cranston (1920-1932), J. W. Hamilton (1932-1934), and Anderson (1934-1939). The seniors in the Southern Church were Soule (1845-1867), Andrew (1867-1871), Paine (1871-1882), Pierce (1882-1884), McTyeire (1884-1889), Keener (1889-1906), A. W. Wilson (1906-1916), Hendrix (1916-1927), Candler (1927-1939).

In 1860 Bishop Morris was given Bishop Asbury's watch with the understanding that it would be passed down from one senior bishop to the next and for long years this custom was faithfully followed in the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the Methodist Episcopal Church, South the same custom was followed with reference to Bishop Andrew's cane. The cane had a mounted silver head on which the names of the senior bishops were engraved in turn. The cane came finally into the possession of Bishop Arthur Moore.

With Methodist union in 1939, the practice was begun of naming a different bishop as president of the Council of Bishops each year. Such presidency is without regard to years of membership in the Council, but generally the office is rotated among the jurisdictions by custom rather than rule. The secretary is

elected for the quadrennium.

For long years in Methodism great store was set by episcopal seniority. This was determined in some cases by close measurement. A bishop elected on the same ballot as another bishop but by a margin of only two or three votes had seniority over the second man for the rest of his episcopal career. The same obtained, of course, in the case of bishops elected at the same conference, one on one day and the other on the next. Seating and presentation at public functions was by way of seniority. Presiding in the General Conferences was by seniority. Participation in the consecration services for bishops was by seniority. Selection of committee choices was also by seniority.

The writing of the episcopal address was by seniority for years in the Church South, although a senior could yield to a junior as Bishop Morrison did to Bishop Hoss in 1918. Bishop Hoss made one-fifth of the address a tribute to Bishop Wilson, who had died during the quadrennium.

In the early years the senior bishop, to the limit of his ability, visited and shared in other Annual Conference sessions in addition to those assigned to him as his own direct responsibility. Most of all, in the Methodist Episcopal Church down to 1900, the bishops chose their own episcopal residences and this too was by seniority. The result was that the older bishops chose what were regarded as the most prestigious areas, such as Washington, New York and Chicago, and the small areas of the deep South and the areas overseas normally went to the newly elected bishops. Most of these in turn moved into what were thought of as more attractive areas as soon as they had the seniority with which to claim them.

Bishop E. O. Haven, the last of the bishops to be elected in 1880, wrote home to his wife, "It is thought Des Moines, San Francisco, St. Paul and Atlanta will be the residences of the new bishops. I must take the one that is left." It turned out that this was San Francisco, which then was far removed from the majority of Methodist Episcopal work, but Haven declares in his journal that he found it a most pleasant assignment.

In 1900 the General Conference assumed the authority to make the assignment of residences.

Over a long period of time the bishops in their sessions not only recognized seniority but likewise held strongly to custom and tradition in determining the procedures to be followed in Council. Among those who dared strongly to challenge these time-honored precedents and to work for change were Bishops Luccock, who seemed to take sheer delight in challenging long accepted attachments, Blake and Oxnam in the Methodist Episcopal Church; and Bishops John M. Moore and McMurry in the M. E. Church, South.

For long years the seniority system was accepted, or at least endured, but beginning with the early years of this century in both the Methodist Episcopal and the M. E. South, younger bishops began to challenge it, and gradually it was broken somewhat. Incidentally, as some of these same bishops who first challenged the seniority system became themselves older bishops, they began to see some attractiveness to the idea of seniority and to lay claim to certain privileges for themselves growing out of their own achieved seniority. While it

was not generally known, at the Uniting Conference in Kansas City in 1939, there were deep feelings among some of the bishops growing out of claims and counter-claims related to seniority. This was the conference at which the seniority system officially died. Today only rarely is the idea of seniority mentioned. Only in the minutes of the Council of Bishops is a seniority list even published, and this only once a quadrennium. In fact, today when all the Jurisdictional Conferences must meet at the same time, the exact order of election would be difficult to establish, and to be accurate in establishing it, the one doing the calculating would have to determine the exact hour of a person's election and also take into account the difference in the time zones in which the respective Jurisdictional Conferences happened to be meeting. The present listing of bishops in the *Discipline* takes no account of the order of election but simply lists alphabetically the names of the persons elected each year.

Over a long period of years the meetings of the bishops took on what appears to be a rather casual character because of the pattern of operation followed. The custom was to go the round of the bishops, again in the order of seniority, and let each bishop bring up what he chose. This process resulted naturally in a disproportionate amount of time being consumed by the more vocal brethren, and in an obvious discontinuity. It was only with the coming of Methodist union, and particularly under the insistence and guidance of Bishop Oxnam as secretary, that more formal agenda procedures were worked out. Throughout the life of Methodism, whether in an earlier or a later day, however, every bishop could always put upon the agenda any item he desired, and there always obtained a silent gentlemen's agreement that no motion would ever be made to limit or close debate in meetings of the bishops.

At least three important matters were usually agenda items in the meetings of the bishops throughout the entire life of American Methodism. The first was what was usually denominated "the state of the church". For long years each bishop was expected to report regularly to the entire body of bishops on the state of the church within the territory for which he had responsibility, and the entire body felt free to comment approvingly or disapprovingly and to make suggestions. This was fully consonant with the idea of a truly general superintendency. The second usual agenda item was represented by consideration of questions related to interpretation of church law. Before the inauguration of the Judicial Council, the bishops as a group had particular responsibility at this point. Even after the Judicial Council was established by The Methodist Church in 1939, the bishops for the next twenty-nine years always spent some time in counseling together about legal problems with which they found themselves confronted as individuals. The third continuing item to which the bishops have always given attention in their meetings has been the promotion of the total interests of the church, such as missions, Christian education, publishing and meeting the continuing financial needs of the Kingdom. From time to time the bishops in their meetings have also addressed themselves to pressing national and international issues and have spoken to the church, the nation and the world upon these. In an earlier day the bishops often discussed the possible transfer of

ministers and the filling of appointments. Since 1939 this matter has been left almost entirely with the bishops immediately concerned with such transfers.

Throughout the life of the church one of the functions of the bishops in council was to make the plan of Annual Conference visitation. For long years they assigned different conferences each year to each bishop, thus seeking to guarantee a genuine general superintendency. In due time, with the rise of the area concept and the demand for more continuity of administration, only occasionally was a bishop assigned to hold a conference session other than those attached to his own episcopal area.

Some of the functions once exercised by the bishops have, as time has gone by, passed to other hands. In the beginning Asbury exercised control over every activity of the church. He not only presided in the General Conference, held the Annual Conference sessions and made the appointments of the preachers, but he also in overseeing the temporal and spiritual affairs of the church, according to the mandate of the *Discipline*, determined the church's missionary strategy, gave general oversight to its publishing house, and provided some supervision for its few and widely scattered educational institutions. His immediate successors in the episcopacy followed the same pattern. With the development of the boards and agencies of the church, the General Conference placed these responsibilities in other hands but kept the bishops as members of the agencies.

Also in the beginning, the bishops edited the *Discipline*. Asbury and Coke gave particular attention to this, and apparently the substitution of the term "bishop" for the original term "superintendent" came by their hand in the revision of the *Discipline* as published in 1787. The revising, according to a notation which Asbury makes in his Journal, was done by Asbury himself with John Dickins, the publishing agent, offering some help. The publication apparently was held up for some months awaiting the concurrence of Bishop Coke. This responsibility for editing the *Discipline* was likewise in time transferred by the General Conference to other hands.

A course of study for ministerial candidates was ordered as early as 1816 by the General Conference. For approximately a century the books in the course were determined by the bishops. In the Methodist Episcopal Church this provision was changed in 1916, largely through the efforts of Harris Franklin Rall of Garrett and Laurren J. Birney of Boston, later elected bishop, who felt that the selection of such books should be in the hands of educators. The bishops concurred in this change largely through the influence of Bishops Cranston and McConnell.

The early bishops were their own secretaries, keeping the records and carrying on correspondence by longhand. Bishop Asbury, despite his constant traveling, managed to write thousands of letters. Approximately three hundred of them are known to be in possession of libraries and individuals here and there. How many may yet lie hidden away in attics somewhere no one can, of course, know. When Asbury died, he left his papers to Bishop McKendree. Most unfortunately for the church of the future, many of these were destroyed in the Publishing House fire in New York in 1836.

Bishop McKendree was meticulous in his correspondence and the preservation of his papers. He left these to the care of Bishop Paine. In the early years some of the preachers would help the bishops with their writing obligations. Thus Bishop Morris once served as amanuensis for Bishop McKendree, as did Bishop Paine later.

The day came at last when the bishops had secretarial help, though the coming of such help in the sense that we know it now of having an office and a stenographer was relatively late. Even some of the bishops of later years made limited or no use of secretarial services. Bishop Flint chose to write many of his letters by longhand. He developed a cryptic style and was able to put more into a few words than perhaps any bishop of the church in his day. Bishop Darlington never had a secretary in all his active episcopal career of twenty-six years. He would peck out his letters on an old-fashioned typewriter, and he had a habit of then underscoring what he judged important. Sometimes he would underscore almost all of a letter with the consequent result that nothing was set off as of special importance.

In the early days the salaries of the bishops were paid out of contributions from the conferences to a common fund. The amount received by the bishops was approximately that received by each traveling preacher. For a period between 1824 and 1840, the salaries of the bishops were paid as part of the operational budget of the Publishing House. Later the salaries were paid out of a fund set aside for the support of the bishops to which all the churches contributed.

The law of the church has made the bishops responsible to the General Conference, and in later years to the Jurisdictional Conference, for both their character and administration. Actual trials of bishops or investigations of bishops for matters involving character have been very few. On the other hand, particularly in an earlier day, charges of maladministration upon the part of a bishop were not unknown and a number of the bishops had to face investigation of such charges before receiving passage of their administration. Probably most often such charges grew out of what was regarded as an abuse of the bishop's appointing power. Sometimes the charges had decidedly personal angles. On one occasion charges were made against Bishop Morrison in one of the western conferences. The committee to hear the matter put the preacher who had made the charges on the witness stand and asked him, "Exactly what was it that the bishop did that was wrong?" And the brother replied with perfect frankness, "He took me off a district." Needless to say, the charge of maladministration was not sustained.

Each Methodist bishop has always been fully independent and all have exactly the same status. Bishop Asbury, following the election of Bishop McKendree in 1808, once spoke of him as "assistant bishop," but the church did not accept the venerable senior's judgment at this point. No Methodist bishop has ever had the power to tell another bishop what to do, and no Methodist bishop is bound even by any action of the bishops meeting in council, except as he chooses so to be. His final responsibility until 1939 was to the General Con-

ference for the passage of his character and administration, and since then it is to his Jurisdictional or Central Conference.

Beginning in 1939, all Methodist bishops had the same seal bearing the words "The Methodist Church" and the name of the particular bishop. The idea of a common episcopal seal is said to trace back to a suggestion made by Bishop Ames in 1852. Prior to that time in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and always in the Church South, each bishop chose the motto for his own seal. Usually this was a portion of Scripture. Bishop Candler, for instance, chose as the motto for his seal, "Separated unto the Gospel"; Bishop Hoss, "The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep"; Bishop Darlington, "Preach the word"; Bishop Dickey, "Not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ"; Bishop Mouzon, "We preach Christ crucified"; and Bishop McMurry, "The foundation of God standeth sure."

## IV

# The Bishops As Itinerant Superintendents

From the beginning Methodism has insisted, in the quaint language of its earliest *Disciplines*, that the bishops or general superintendents shall "travel throughout the connection." This all Methodist bishops have done without sparing themselves, until death has released them or until, as the years have begun to take their toll, the church has seen fit "to release them from the obligation to travel."

Bishop Asbury set the pattern for all future bishops of the church by being constantly on the road. He personally held all the sessions of all the Annual Conferences and shuttled back and forth between New England and South Carolina and between the Eastern Seaboard and the far away Cumberland Country with unfailing regularity. He always kept the far horizon in mind and one of the great regrets of his life was the fact that he never got to visit Mississippi, which in his day represented the far reaches of settlement. He had no home anywhere in the world and lived out of his saddle bags. He ate and slept in the homes of the people. In some cases these were some of the mansions of Colonial America, but in many more cases they were rude cabins in the wilderness where an entire family shared a single room. On countless nights when he found himself far from any settlement, he would wrap himself in his blanket and sleep on the ground under the silent stars. As he traveled, he preached wherever even a few people could be assembled, and his arrival came to be anticipated everywhere, for he was a familiar figure on almost every road in the land. His one great fear with reference to the preachers was that by any means they should cease to travel, and he wrote in his Journal, "I will set them an example," which he did in a noble and devoted way indeed. In the course of the thirty-two years he served as bishop, he crossed the Alleghenies sixty times and it is estimated that he covered a total of more than 300,000 miles of travel.

Following Asbury's example, other Methodist bishops have traveled unceasingly, each in his own way and according to his own pace in doing the work whereunto God and the church have called them. They have gone again and again to every corner of these United States to carry forward their mission, and almost all of them have crossed the seas at one time or another at the call of the church. Some of them have felt it their particular calling to lift up the banner of the Gospel in places of earth far distant from home. Notable examples of this passion to travel to the ends of the earth to plant the Gospel are Bishop William Taylor, who began the work in California in the days of the Gold Rush and who later planted chains of self-supporting missions across India, Africa and Latin America; or Bishop Thoburn, who did so much to establish the church in the far East; or Bishop Lambuth, who was born of missionary parents in China, labored in Japan, and in 1911 opened work in the Congo.

Often in the beginning, as they could, the bishops journeyed together, thus composing an episcopal traveling team. Particularly in the early days and in pioneer situations, a bishop would take with him a traveling companion, both for companionship and for assistance and protection. Bishop Asbury sometimes took with him a black man named Harry Hosier, who was such an effective preacher that often the people preferred to hear him preach rather than the Bishop. Bishop Coke said of Black Harry, "I believe he is one of the best preachers in the world." Again Asbury took with him on occasion William McKendree, Jesse Lee, and others.

The means by which the bishops have traveled have been many and varied and have, of course, changed with the years. Bishop Asbury traveled by horseback, following tirelessly the wilderness trails. There were flatboats in his day, but strange to say, while he occasionally mentions ferries, he does not mention traveling by flatboat. Apparently the decision to travel by horseback was affected in part at least by the fact that this method allowed him to be in the homes of the people along the way. Late in life friends provided a carriage for him which he sometimes used as age and infirmity came upon him. Like Asbury, Whatcoat, McKendree, George and Roberts all traveled by horseback. Bishop Roberts, who had a cabin in the Indiana wilderness and from there sought to serve the whole church, and who died in 1843, is generally regarded as the last of the totally horseback bishops. When he moved to Indiana he was given Bishop Asbury's last carriage, which he used in making the trip there but seldom, if ever, in his future travels.

At first Bishop Soule traveled only by horseback, and he made three trips across the continent in this way. In time he turned to using in part the services of the stagecoach. When Bishop Roberts heard this, he was greatly disturbed and expressed strongly his conviction that "when the church turns to luxury, it loses power."

For almost the next hundred years, however, the bishops, like the circuit riders, made some use of horses in their travels. In the writer's own home conference the last of the known circuit riders' horses, one "Adeline", died as late as 1933.

The era for the bishops' traveling by horseback was followed by the era of traveling by stagecoach. The stagecoach routes were limited, the roads were bad, and at best stage travel was slow and wearying. The coaches were often crowded, and the company in such crowded quarters was not always desirable. Often some of the passengers had to ride on top of the coach, exposed to the weather, and in this, too, the bishops had to take their turn. All the bishops of this era made constant use of this mode of travel. Bishop Paine, in 1846, traveled by stagecoach from his home in LaGrange, Alabama, to Memphis where he caught a steamboat for Hannibal, Missouri, the site of his first conference. Bishop Pierce, in 1859, crossed the continent by stagecoach to hold the conferences in California, a journey of two thousand miles without rest. His wife traveled with him. His biographer affirms that she was the first woman thus to cross the continent, but this would be impossible to establish. His little daughter also went

along on this most unusual trip. The taxing journey took from April to June. After visiting numerous points in the West, Pierce did not reach home until December.

The coming of the era of the canal boat served to ease travel for the bishops, and Bishop Thomson spoke admiringly of such boats as "these floating palaces that can make four miles an hour."

With the coming of the steamboat, the bishops began to use this new and far more pleasant method of travel whenever possible. In due time the steam-boats came to be replete with conveniences and luxury, with good staterooms and excellent food. The bishops of this period, in the account of their travels, often refer to the restfulness of river travel and make frequent notations regarding interesting sights and experiences along the way, but again and again they complain of the rowdiness, the gambling, the dancing and the worldly spirit of some who were part of the boat's company upon these river journeys.

With the coming of the railroads in the 1850's and 1860's, and their still further extension in the 70's and 80's, the traveling responsibilities of the bishops were made still easier and the time necessitated for travel between points was reduced considerably. The coming of what was at first called the "palace car" and later the "Pullman car" made rail travel still more comfortable. It was a long time, however, before a more or less complete railroad system was developed, and during this period the bishops sometimes had to accomplish their travel by a combination of methods.

An interesting example of such combination of travel methods is found in the case of Bishop Pierce as he made his second round of annual conferences in 1855, taking his young son with him on the journey. Leaving his home at Sparta, Georgia, on September 20, he took the stage for Double Springs, Georgia, where he caught the railroad to Atlanta. There he took another train to Chattanooga, and there another for Nashville. At Nashville he took a boat and followed the Cumberland, Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to St. Louis. There he bought a horse and buggy and then went by boat up the Missouri to Booneville. At Booneville he began the drive overland to the Asbury Manual Labor School in the Creek Nation, where he held the Indian Mission Conference, beginning on October 10. From there he continued driving overland to Fort Smith, Arkansas, where he held the Arkansas Conference, and thence to El Dorado, where he held the Wachita Conference. Thence he set out again by buggy for Marshall, the seat of the East Texas Conference. There he sold his horse and buggy and proceeded overland with friends to Galveston. From Galveston he took a boat bound for New Orleans, there another boat to Mobile, and there another boat to Montgomery. At Montgomery he took a train to Opelika and on to Columbus, Georgia. There he took another train to Atlanta and thence another to Warrenton, and then by private conveyance he went to his home at Sparta. He had spent almost four months on the road and had covered better than four thousand miles. This was but his second episcopal journey. There were countless others that lay ahead in the next thirty years until death at last would release him from his labors.

Another interesting example of early episcopal travel is found in the case of a still earlier journey made by Bishop Morris in 1841. From his home in Cincinnati he went by stage to Indianapolis and from there in an open wagon to Chicago, and on to Platteville, Wisconsin, where he held the Rock River Conference. He then made his way to Jacksonville, Illinois, where he held conference, and on to Palmyra, Missouri, where he held the Missouri Conference. He then organized a party of five to go to Texas, two of the five being preacher volunteers for Texas. The party had one covered wagon drawn by two horses, and a light buggy drawn by one horse. They carried a tent and cooking utensils and camped along the way. The journey from St. Louis to Batesville, Arkansas, where he was to hold the Arkansas Conference, took from October 19 to November 5. The group left Batesville on November 16 and reached San Augustine in time to meet the Texas Conference on December 23. Finally, on January 31, he reached Houston, where he took passage on a steamer to Galveston and hence to New Orleans. He then proceeded up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Cincinnati, reaching home on March 2, 1842.

The foregoing could be duplicated from the lives of other bishops, and are only examples of what it meant during this era "to travel throughout the connection."

With the coming of a complete railroad system, and later of the automobile and the aeroplane, the traveling of the later bishops in the episcopal line of succession was made far easier and less time consuming. For most bishops, however, greater facility in travel has come to mean only more travel and more engagements, and the Methodist episcopacy, as always, continues to live on the road.

In an earlier day when travel was difficult, the bishops were on the road for long weeks and months, particularly during the conference season, but the remainder of the year they usually spent in and near their homes. At home they were regular attendants of whatever local church they regarded as their home church. Occasionally they preached, but much of the time they sat in the congregation. Bishop Soule lived for years in the then small rural community of Madison, Tennessee. He regularly attended City Road Church, then a church on a circuit. One of the early pastors, Jerry Cullom, long years ago wrote an interesting book in which he related his pastor experiences. He tells of his relationship with the senior bishop of the church as one of his parishioners. He affirms that the bishop was regular in his attendance, sympathetic with the efforts of the young preacher, and not averse to giving advice. He laid particular stress upon dependability and promptness, saying to his young pastor, "For sixty years I have never disappointed an audience or been ten minutes late." Bishop Hargrove, when he was not on the road, was a regular attendant at a modest-sized church, the West Nashville Church, and those who were children at that time found him particularly interested in them and to the end of their days held him both in awe and in affection. Bishop Darlington had a regular pew in Johnson Memorial Church in Huntington, West Virginia, where he regularly sat on Sundays at home. Bishop Hamline, despite the high place he attained in the

councils of the Church, not only attended worship services in his local church, but likewise attended class meetings regularly with all the faithfulness and sense of need for Christian fellowship of the humblest Methodist of his day. Bishop Andrew not only attended the worship services of his local church, but also went to Sunday school and was present at Sunday school on his last Sunday on earth.

As the bishops of Methodism have lived on the road, so many of them have died on the road. Bishop Asbury died on the road desperately trying to reach Baltimore, the seat of the 1816 General Conference. Bishop Coke died and was buried at sea, trying to reach India as the culmination of his missionary dreams. Bishop Whatcoat died on the road at the home of a hospitable friend, as did also Bishop George en route to the then distant Holston Conference. Of the first six bishops, therefore, four died on the road.

Bishop Emory likewise never completed his last journey. Exactly what happened was never known, but he left Baltimore early one morning and some hours later his broken body and his horse were found beside the road.

Bishop Bascom took suddenly ill in a stagecoach. He was taken to the home of a friend nearby, died there several days later and was buried in the city where he died.

Bishops Thomson, Kavanaugh and Tigert all died on the road while meeting their schedules of annual conferences, the first in West Virginia, the second in Mississippi, and the third in Indian Territory. Bishop E. O. Haven died at Salem, Oregon, where he had gone to hold the conference.

Bishop Spellmeyer died alone in his room while holding a session of the New Jersey Conference, his body being discovered the next day. Bishop Atkins died three days after holding the Little Rock Conference. Bishop D. H. Moore died on a train, attempting to make one more journey.

Practically all the bishops at times have gone on prolonged missionary journeys to the far places of the earth. On such a journey Bishop Wiley died in China, J. N. Fitzgerald died in Hong Kong, Seth Ward and Lambuth in Japan, and Kingsley, after traveling westward around the world, died suddenly in Beruit on his way home. Bishops Leonard and Garth both died in aeroplane accidents during World War II, while on special missions for the church. Of the later day bishops, Bishops Baxter and Middleton died on the road while carrying out their episcopal responsibilities.

The only bishop to die by violence was Bishop Hartzell. After endless journeys in Africa, and while living quietly in retirement, he was murdered in Cincinnati by young terrorists.

The itinerant road in Methodism runs round the world and never ends. Every Methodist preacher pledges himself to travel the road unto the end of the day, and all bishops in any way worthy of the office have tried to set a consistent example of what Methodism asks of all its preachers, tirelessly and faithfully "traveling throughout the connection."

## The Bishops and Their Families

Most of the bishops of The Methodist Church and its antecedent bodies came from families of modest circumstances. They were largely the sons of farmers, artisans and small shopkeepers. Typical of the overwhelming majority of them are Bishop Asbury, who was the son of a gardener; Bishop Warne, the son of a farmer; Bishop Taylor, the son of a tanner; and Bishop Oldham, the son of a British officer commanding troops in India. Bishops L. H. King, Camphor and Clair, Sr. were sons of former slaves. Some seventy of the bishops were sons of Methodist preachers and grew up in parsonage homes. These represent twenty-seven per cent of the episcopal total.

A few of the bishops grew up in homes of comparative wealth. Bishop Capers was the son of a prosperous planter of pre-Civil War days; Bishop Early, of a well-to-do landowner; Bishop Emory, of a successful jurist; Bishop Paine, of a wealthy local magistrate; and Bishop Welch was the son of a banker of some prominence in New York City.

Several of the bishops had fathers who were particularly colorful characters. The father of Seth Ward was a soldier in the Mexican War who was wounded in the Battle of San Jacinto. He served also in the Confederate Army, and for some years was something of a local hero.

The father of Bishop McCoy was a minister, but in early life he was a Confederate soldier and was reputed to have been associated at one time with the once notorious Quantrell's Guerrillas.

The father of Bishop Pierce was the inimitable Lovick Pierce of Georgia, a Southern leader in the movement for division in 1844 and the rejected fraternal messenger of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South to the 1848 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. However, Lovick Pierce lived to see the situation change between Northern and Southern Methodism and at the age of ninety-two was again selected to bear the greetings of the Church South to the Methodist Episcopal Church meeting in General Conference session in 1876 in Baltimore. He began the journey, but because of infirmities he was not able to complete it and had to be content with sending a letter. Two other fraternal delegates from the Church South were present.

One of the most interesting family backgrounds of any of the bishops is that of Bishop Jesse T. Peck, elected in 1872. His father, Luther Peck, was a blacksmith in New York State and a Methodist class leader for many years. He had five sons, all of whom became Methodist preachers. An interesting account of this unique family was published about the turn of the century entitled, *Luther Peck and His Five Sons*.

The family backgrounds of the bishops include a number of close relationships. Bishop Matthew W. Clair, Senior, elected in 1920, and Bishop Matthew W. Clair, Junior, elected in 1952, were father and son.

Bishop J. W. E. Sommer, elected in 1946, was the father of Bishop Ernst

Sommer, elected a bishop of The United Methodist Church in 1968.

Bishop John W. Hamilton, elected in 1900, was an older brother to Bishop Franklin Hamilton, elected in 1916, and had brought him up in his home. Edwin Holt Hughes, elected in 1908, and Matthew S. Hughes, elected in 1916, were also brothers, as were Bishops A. Frank Smith, elected in 1930, and W. Angie Smith, elected in 1944.

Bishop Gilbert Haven, elected in 1872, and Bishop E. O. Haven, elected in 1880, were cousins, as were also Bishops Bickley and Burns, both elected in 1920. Bishop McConnell, elected in 1912, and Bishop Ensley, elected in 1952, were uncle and nephew.

Bishop Thirkield, elected in 1912, was the son-in-law of Bishop Gilbert Haven, elected in 1872. Bishop Tigert, elected in 1906, was the son-in-law of Bishop McTyeire, elected in 1866. Bishop Pickett, elected in 1936, was the son-in-law of Bishop J. W. Robinson. Bishop Elphick, elected in 1936, was the father-in-law of Bishop Zottele, elected in 1962.

The first bishops of Methodism in America were largely without family ties. Bishop Coke was either a bachelor or a widower for all except seven years between his coming into office in 1784 and his death in 1814. Bishop Asbury was a bachelor, as were also Bishops Whatcoat and McKendree. Bishop George was a widower. The first bishop with a family was Robert R. Roberts, elected in 1816. Between that date and 1968 all bishops were married or had been married at the time of election.

Almost all the bishops married when they were young, and in most cases the women to whom they were married at the time of their election had shared with them over a considerable period of years the trials and fortunes of the itinerant road. Quite a few of the bishops were married more than once. Bishop Coke was married twice, the first time at the age of fifty-eight. Bishop Paine was married three times, as were also Bishops Andrew and Lowe. The second wife of Bishop Andrew owned slaves, which fact occasioned the request of the General Conference of 1844 that he desist from exercising his office and helped precipitate the division of the church. Bishop Morris also was married three times, the last time at the age of seventy-eight.

Generally speaking, the marriages of the bishops were happy marriages and their home life represented a wholesome example for the people to follow. Perhaps the saddest exception was to be found in the case of the second marriage of Bishop Hurst. He was elected in 1880 and in 1890 his first wife, with whom he had shared a rich life, died, and he married again in 1892. In 1898, the second Mrs. Hurst, taking their child with her, went to Europe for the announced purpose of cultivating her voice. After some months she refused to answer the bishop's letters and avoided completely his efforts to establish contact with her and the child. He carried the burden of this sorrow the rest of his days but refused to allow it to interfere with his devotion to his work. He and a daughter by his first marriage made their home together for the rest of his days.

Many of the bishops, according to their biographers, manifested a spirit of great devotion to the women to whom they were married. Bishop Frank Smith

made it a habit to write to Mrs. Smith each day during his long absences on the itinerant road. The wife of Bishop Levi Scott was an invalid for fifty years, but throughout this long period he was undying in his thoughtfulness and attention and concern. Bishop Gilbert Haven lost his wife some years before he was elected and he never got over the loss. He used to go to the cemetery and prostrate himself in tears upon her grave. His diary makes continuing references to her and to his love for her. On the ninth anniversary of her death he writes, "More than half the time we have been married she has been in Paradise."

When Bishop Eugene Hendrix was elected in 1886, his wife was not present at the General Conference. She wrote to him at Richmond, where the General Conference was meeting, "The telegram bearing the sad tidings of your election to the office of a bishop reached me about an hour ago. How can I give you up, my husband? I hope I appreciate the honor the church has bestowed upon you, but what a lonely life my future will be." This letter is perhaps typical of the mixed feelings of many of the wives of the bishops. They have appreciated, of course, the honor that has come to their husbands at the hand of the church, but at the same time they have realized how costly a thing their husbands' "traveling throughout the connection" can be to them and to their children. Most of the wives and children of the bishops have made the necessary adjustments in family life in an admirable way.

Many of the bishops' wives have been gifted women who have themselves taken strong leadership, especially in the women's work of the church. This was particularly true of Mrs. E. W. Parker, who was one of the founders of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Mrs. R. K. Hargrove, Mrs. D. W. Clark, Mrs. J. M. Walden, Mrs. J. C. Hartzell, Mrs. Thomas Nicholson, Mrs. W. P. Thirkield and Mrs. Francis J. McConnell, all of whom held national office in the women's organizations of the church and gave significant leadership therein. At one time in both the Methodist Episcopal Church and the M. E. Church, South, the wives of the bishops were designated as vice-presidents of some of the church-wide women's organizations.

Some of the bishops' wives achieved prominence in other fields. The second wife of Bishop Key, Mrs. Kidd-Key, was a gifted educator, the president for many years of Kidd-Key College at Sherman, Texas. The bishop was married to her in 1893. Mrs. J. H. McCoy was also an educator of note and was for some years following the death of the bishop the president of Athens College in Alabama.

As the bishops have been individuals, so the bishops' wives have been individuals also, some of them decidedly so. One of the first to dare to break the early stereotype of the parson's wife was Mrs. Simpson, who herself came from a family of some means and who did not hide her love for fine black silk dresses, laces and jewelry, despite the ancient Methodist opposition to the same.

The wives of the bishops traditionally have been marked by a certain dignity of bearing, a reserve of manner, a possession of self and an intense interest in church affairs. Typical of many of them of only a few years ago, particularly in the memory of those of us who are now older, is Mrs. James C. Baker. She was

the perfect lady, always in full command of herself and always intently interested in what was going on, though very measured in conversation. She was given at one time to wearing a hat that had attached to it a feather which stood erect. A friend, describing her on one occasion when she was particularly interested in a subject under discussion, wrote, "Even the feather was listening."

The first of what might be termed an episcopal residence was the log cabin which Bishop Roberts built with his own hands in the far Indiana wilderness in 1819, three years after his election. From this remote spot he made on horseback his seemingly endless rounds to all the far corners of the country. In this cabin in the wilderness Mrs. Roberts lived the typical hard life of a pioneer woman, cooking, spinning, weaving and caring for the garden and the farm animals when the bishop was absent. It was quite fitting that for her funeral discourse Bishop Soule should choose the text, "She worketh willingly with her hands."

Like Bishop Roberts, the bishops over a long period of years selected home sites of their own choosing. The location mattered little, because for almost a century each bishop was assigned different conferences each year. Some of these episcopal homes were lovely places of rest and retreat to which the bishop returned from his journeying to and fro across the earth. Bishop Pierce had such a home at Sparta, Georgia, which he called "Sunshine." Bishop Paine had such a home at Aberdeen, Mississippi, which he called "Mingo." Bishop Simpson had an attractive home in Philadelphia, given to him by friends there and furnished by friends in New York. Bishop Morris had a lovely home at Springfield, Ohio, which he named "Salubria." In one of the church papers of that day the bishop describes it as including two acres of ground, a substantial residence and barn, a truck-patch and cow pasture, and a small orchard. He goes on to describe his horse, cow, pigs, chickens, and cats and dogs, and concludes, "I have been a citizen of four states, but have found my last camping-place this side of Jordan."

Other episcopal homes were perhaps not quite so impressive as these, but they were nevertheless places of dear meaning for the bishops concerned.

The era of fixed episcopal areas did not come in the Methodist Episcopal Church until 1912. Beginning in 1872, the General Conference specified certain cities of residence, and up to 1900 the bishops assigned themselves to them, the choice being made by seniority. In the M. E. Church, South, each bishop was free to live where he would but the conferences assigned to him changed, at first annually and later quadrennially.

In establishing The Methodist Church in 1939, it was provided that each bishop should live within his area. Bishop U. V. W. Darlington, independent character that he was, chose to ignore this instruction and to administer the Louisville Area from his home in Huntington, West Virginia. He thus lived, not only out of the area, but even out of the jurisdiction of which the Louisville Area is a part. In the old Church Extension Building in Louisville there is a small coat room and on the wall a particular peg upon which the bishop used to hang his hat when he visited there. He would touch the peg affectionately and say, "This is my episcopal residence."

A few of the bishops have had fairly large personal fortunes. Bishops Early,

Ames, Baker and Clark all acquired considerable wealth either by inheritance or by their own effort. Bishop Hamline was a man of unusual means for his day and was noted for his liberality. At one time he gave \$25,000 to Hamline University. He made it a practice to return his episcopal salary, as he could meet his needs without it.

Bishop Simpson, too, became a man of considerable means. Mrs. Simpson had inherited some property including at one time holdings in a brewery. Toward the last the bishop had a salary of \$4,500, plus fees from lectures. He also had a home in Philadelphia which had been given to him by friends and a summer home at Long Branch which, likewise, had been given to him. He had sizable investments and had been left a large bequest by a wealthy friend. He left to his heirs an estate of over \$100,000, which was regarded a large estate at that time.

Bishop Coke, the first bishop, had a private fortune by which he not only supported himself but also numerous philanthropies.

Several bishops married into wealthy families — Bishop Warren into the Iliff family of Denver, and Bishop Hendrix into the Scarritt family of Kansas City.

The bishops' families of an earlier day largely reflected not only the idea that a marked dignity should characterize the episcopal home, but also the general assumptions regarding a proper home life that obtained in the Victorian era. There was apparently a great deal of formality in episcopal family behavior not only between children and parents, and parents and children, but likewise between husband and wife. Numerous family letters that are still extant reflect this. Some episcopal wives never forgot for a moment that their husbands were bishops of the church. Mrs. Kavanaugh to the end of her days never called her husband by his first name, but always addressed him as "Bishop". Bishop Denny, in his addresses to young preachers being received into the conference, used to admonish them about too informal dress around the home, affirming that such practice showed a certain disrespect for the family.

A number of the bishops had sons who entered the ministry of Methodism. The exact number is difficult to determine as the story in so many cases is lost amid the shadows of history. Among those of later days having sons in the ministry were Bishops Anderson, Stuntz, Clair, Sr., Arthur J. Moore, Cushman, Magee, Garth, Flint, Oxnam, Watkins, Sommer, Dawson, Phillips, Watts, and Stockwell.

The bishops now living having sons in the ministry are Bishops Brashares, Henley, Kearns, Frank, Raines, Crutchfield, Dixon, Goodrich, Sparks, Warman and Short.

No episcopal daughter has as yet joined the ranks of the ministry; however, the daughters of Bishops Welch and McConnell did fill high administrative positions with the Board of Missions.

Some of the bishops left no descendants, while others left only a few. In some cases these descendants continue the original strong family attachment to Methodism, while in others they have transferred to other ecclesiastical bodies,

or as far as is known, have lost concern for the faith and the church of their fathers.

One of the most striking comments upon much episcopal family life is carved in stone on a monument in the churchyard of the Washington Street Church in Columbia, South Carolina. There the famous Bishop Capers and his wife are buried. It is a tall monument of the old style with four faces. On the front side there is a fitting tribute to Bishop Capers with mention of his rich, significant and far-reaching ministry. On the back side the wife's name appears with this lovely notation, "It was she who brought us first to God. The Children." It is a fitting comment that could be true of more than one episcopal family. The bishops themselves at the call of the church have been almost constantly on the road. Because of their necessary long absences, they have cherished all the more a home which is a dear haven of joy and peace toward which their steps may turn from time to time. If they have had such a home, and if their children have known such a home, it must largely be because of the love and fidelity and devotion to God and to the good of the wives who have shared life with them. A number of persons have written from time to time the story of at least some of the bishops of Methodism. Perhaps some day someone will write the story of the bishops' wives.

## VI

# Friendships and Crosscurrents Among the Bishops

The bishops of Methodism have generally been strongly individualistic, despite the fact that they at all times have constituted a single general superintendency and by law and by choice have operated as a team. Some of them, in fact a considerable number of them, have had about them something of the *prima donna*. The law of Methodism protects each bishop in his individuality, making him finally accountable, not to his episcopal brethren, but to the General Conference, or since 1939 to the Jurisdictional or Central Conference. The Council of Bishops itself is only a consultative body and possesses no power to tell a particular bishop what to do. It is this continuing insistence upon the equal status of each bishop that accounts for the fact that Methodism has never yielded to the proposal to have a presiding bishop or an archbishop or similar office. With each bishop protected in his individuality, and most of them persons of more or less strong will, there have inevitably been at times marked currents and crosscurrents within the episcopal body.

Some of the bishops have been close friends. In some cases this friendship has dated back across long, long years. A striking example is found in the case of Bishops David H. Moore and Charles C. McCabe of the Methodist Episcopal Church, both of whom came from the relatively small town of Athens, Ohio, and who were playmates when they were children. Bishop Earl Cranston likewise was from Athens. Bishops Cranston and McCabe were elected together in 1896 and Bishop David Moore in 1900. The three whose lives had thus been long intertwined constituted something of a triumvirate in the episcopal board.

The two bishops who together steered the course of the destiny of Methodism in the United States in its earliest days were likewise close. This was true prior to Bishop McKendree's election. He and Asbury often traveled together and kept in constant correspondence. This closeness continued when they were joint superintendents and was not hurt by the fact that they occasionally differed sharply.

Another example of closeness among the bishops is found in the case of Bishops McTyeire and Keener of the Church South, who had been fellow pastors in the Alabama Conference and both of whom served as editor of the *New Orleans Christian Advocate*. Bishop McTyeire was elected in 1866, evidently with the help of Bishop Keener, and in 1870 Bishop Keener had the endorsement of Bishop McTyeire, which at that time was practically equivalent to election. The two of them served together in the College of Bishops until the death of McTyeire in 1889, when Keener became senior bishop and ruled with a strong hand until his own retirement in 1900 at the age of eighty. These two long-time friends, chiefly by the power of their personalities, largely dominated affairs in

the Church South for a period of almost forty years.

A close friendship existed between Bishop Marvin, elected in the Church South in 1866, and Bishop Hendrix, elected twenty years later. Both were from Missouri, and their paths crossed first when Bishop Hendrix was quite a young man. Marvin took a strong fatherly interest in Hendrix as a young preacher, and when he made a round-the-world trip in 1876, he took Hendrix with him. The experiences of this difficult and prolonged journey cemented the friendship between the two all the more strongly. Bishop Marvin lived to see the growing acceptance of Hendrix in the Church, but died nine years before his election to the episcopacy.

Another strong friendship worth noting is that which existed between Bishop Earl Cranston of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Bishop Hendrix of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Both were ardent advocates of Methodist unification and each was far ahead of many of his colleagues in his desire to see one Methodist Church. They were in each other's company frequently, corresponded continually, and often worked together on committee assignments and otherwise. Neither of them lived to see the final consummation in 1939 of that which together they had so long dreamed.

Bishop Hoss of the Church South and Bishop John W. Hamilton of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the other hand, appeared to be conflicting personalities, and they clashed frequently, sometimes with bitterness, in meetings where Methodist union was under discussion.

There was a close friendship between Bishops Morris and Simpson, between Andrew and Capers, between Hoss and Denny, between Haygood and Candler, between Hendrix and Galloway, and between A. W. Wilson and Denny.

There have been, of course, other strong personal friendships existing between some of the bishops, some of them in earlier years belonging now to forgotten history and the total number of them being too numerous to mention. Striking and familiar examples of strong friendships between bishops of a later day are those between Bishop Ainsworth and Bishop Arthur J. Moore, who was in many respects his "son in the Gospel"; Bishops John M. Moore and Holt; McConnell and Welch; Hughes and McConnell; Magee and Lowe; and Baker and Welch.

On the other hand, there have sometimes existed pronounced rivalries, strong antipathies, and serious conflicts of opinion between some of the bishops, despite which they have had to work together as best they could.

A case in point is the relationship between Bishop Simpson and Bishop Ames. Prior to their election they had been more or less rivals for leadership in the Indiana Conference. Both were elected on the same ballot in 1852. Ames was a wary politician and a master strategist, who apparently all his days entertained some measure of jealousy of Simpson. It is a long story, but again and again during their years together in the episcopal board, he advocated assignments for Simpson that caused the latter both embarrassment and difficulty. Always he seems to have managed to take his position in an adroit way and to give the impression of doing something other than what he actually was attempting to

do. Simpson, too, was a political strategist of no little ability, but he never seems to have taken a lead in embarrassing Ames in the way Ames often did in embarrassing him. Despite this continuing conflict the two sometimes found themselves on the same side of a question, as for instance, during the Civil War in their joint welcoming of the order of Secretary of War Stanton, which meant that the conquests of the Union Armies should also become the conquests of the Methodist Episcopal Church and that they as bishops would be allowed to appoint preachers loyal to the Union to Southern Methodist pulpits.

Again, in 1876, they found themselves on the same side of the question when the Methodist Episcopal Church was considering the advisability of establishing separate Negro conferences.

Another example of strained relationships between bishops is found in the case of Bishops Mouzon and Cannon of the Church South. Conflict of opinion and a tendency to disagree developed between these two bishops over a lengthening period of years. It became intensified and reached its culmination in the early 30's, at which time Bishop Cannon was the subject of both church and government investigations. Bishop Mouzon either could not disguise, or did not choose to hide, the low regard in which he came to hold Bishop Cannon, and this was dramatized publicly at the organizing conference of the Methodist Church of Brazil in 1930 and at the session of the Virginia Conference of 1932, where Bishop Cannon appeared as an uninvited guest and Bishop Mouzon refused to recognize him. Bishop Cannon on his own initiative claimed the floor to address the conference, whereupon the presiding bishop turned his chair toward the back wall until Cannon had finished speaking. Bishop Cannon, in his autobiography published after Bishop Mouzon's death, goes at length into the story of this strained relationship. Mouzon, on the other hand, did not seek to make explanations and was content to let matters speak for themselves.

There have been other personal antagonisms among the bishops, but most of them happily are now buried with the yesterdays and are recalled only by those few persons who major in lost chapters in Methodist history.

Generally, any sharp division between individual bishops has grown out of their representing opposite positions rather than out of personal antagonism. In the Church South an example is found in the case of Bishop Pierce of Georgia, elected in 1854, and Bishop McTyeire, elected in 1866. Bishop Pierce was an arch conservative who was afraid that such things as the abandonment of required attendance at class meetings, or a theologically trained ministry or the use of organs and choirs would hurt the church. Bishop McTyeire, on the other hand, was a liberal for his day who advocated laity rights, a trained ministry and moderate innovations in church life and practice. In the College of Bishops, and otherwise, the two men often clashed simply because their basic viewpoints clashed.

More important historically than occasional personal divisions among the bishops have been those divisions which have arisen over issues upon which the bishops as a group have found themselves honestly divided. These have at times involved the entire episcopal body, with all the bishops or practically all the

bishops taking one side or the other.

The most familiar division among the bishops was, of course, that which came in 1844 with the separation of the church. There were five bishops at the time that the fateful General Conference of that year assembled in New York. They had tried faithfully during the previous tumultuous quadrennium to hold the church together, and during the General Conference itself they made a last desperate effort looking to that end, but eventually, like the delegates, they found themselves also hopelessly divided. Bishop Hedding was a New Englander and fully sympathetic with the Abolitionists but anxious to find some compromise solution if possible. Finally the break came. Bishops Hedding, Morris and Waugh remained with the Methodist Episcopal Church, while Bishops Soule and Andrew sided with the position taken by the Southern delegates and a year later became identified with the M. E. Church, South. Bishops Janes and Hamline, elected at the 1844 Conference, chose to stand with the bishops remaining with the Methodist Episcopal Church.

In both Methodisms the bishops divided sharply over the issue of theological education, beginning in the 1870's or thereabout. For the first hundred years Methodism had no seminaries. Young preachers were required to take the course of study prescribed by the bishops, beginning as far back as 1816. In addition, in their beginning years they were usually assigned as junior preachers, which meant that they found thereby at least some measure of training under an older minister. There was a great fear that what were commonly called, by some, "preacher factories" might in some way subtract from the religious experience of the ministry. In the Church South, as the movement for the establishment of theological education got under way under the inspired leadership of Bishop McTyeire, Bishop Pierce, the then senior bishop, stood at first in violent opposition. The other members of the episcopal college lined up with one or the other of these leaders, either actively or sympathetically. The leadership of McTyeire finally prevailed, and the eventual result was the establishment of Vanderbilt University with a Biblical Department.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church the bishops as early as 1840 had appeared rather unfavorable to the establishment of seminaries, but held that, if established, they should be under the control of the General Conference. In the years that followed there was considerable difference of opinion both among the ministry and the laity as to the wisdom of such establishment. This difference of opinion expressed itself in the church press and on the floor of conferences.

Bishop O. C. Baker, elected in 1852, was a strong early advocate of theological seminaries, and for a time in his early years taught classes in theology. He did not live to see the establishment and full acceptance of the seminaries of the church, as he died in 1871. At length leadership in such acceptance was given largely by Bishop Hedding and Bishop Foster.

Another division among the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church came about in the 1870's over the question of establishing separate Negro conferences. At first, the conferences which the Methodist Episcopal Church organized in the South were integrated conferences, but in time the feeling arose

among many in the church that it might be well to develop separate Negro conferences. This feeling was shared by such bishops as Simpson, Ames and Wiley, all of whom for long years had proved themselves strong friends of the Negro and some of whom had been active in the founding of the Freedmen's Aid Society. Bishop Gilbert Haven raised strong objection, feeling deeply that any separation of any kind in the church based upon race denied the fact that all believers are one in Christ Jesus. He battled bravely for his viewpoint and felt that he largely battled alone so far as his episcopal colleagues were concerned. When the racial conferences were established, he believed that the church had made a serious mistake and he went to his grave a few years later bitterly disappointed. Bishops Newman and Hartzell shared at that time the same opinion as Haven, but their election to the episcopacy lay yet some years ahead.

The last several decades of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century saw in Methodism a prolonged conflict over the subject of holiness, and particularly over the second blessing theory of holiness. Congregations sometimes became sharply divided over the subject, as did also a number of Annual Conferences. Quite a number of people left the Methodist Church, and several strong new and vital churches were formed, the starting membership of which was made up largely of former Methodists who had come to accept the second blessing interpretation. It must be admitted that in some cases the conscientious views of these persons were not shown the respect by some bishops and others which they should have been shown, and all too often the point was reached where one way or another some good people felt forced out of the church of their fathers at whose altars they had first found the Saviour. So sharp was this prolonged conflict that it was commonly referred to as "the Holiness War."

The bishops of both Methodisms were naturally caught up, one way or another, in this church-wide tension. All of them who were in the active relation had to deal with its effects in local churches and in Annual Conferences, and it must be admitted that some bishops were wiser and kindlier in their efforts to deal with the situation than were others.

From the beginning Methodism had always stressed going on to perfection. Asbury laid continuous stress upon holiness of heart and life and constantly urged the preachers to do the same thing. Bishops Whatcoat and George professed sanctification, as did also a number of the later bishops. Bishop Hamline, for instance in 1842, made a journey to New Albany, Indiana, the deliberate purpose of which was to seek this experience under the guidance of the saintly pastor of the church there, W. V. Daniels. And he records that he found it alone in his room after breakfast on Monday morning after seeking it in vain at an altar service on Saturday night and throughout a long day of soul-searching on Sunday. Likewise, Bishop E. O. Haven wrote in his journal on January 26, 1881, "I pray often and earnestly that I may have a genuine healthy ambition to do good and please God, and it does seem to me by strict self-examination that God has given me this grace. I am often in possession, so far as I can see, of perfect love."

While Methodism had thus long stressed holiness and Christian perfection, beginning in the 1840's there grew up this strong emphasis upon sanctification as a definite second work of grace. Some of the bishops, like many of the pastors and the laity of the churches, found themselves caught up in this movement. One of the leading advocates of the emphasis was Mrs. Phoebe Palmer, as was also her physician husband, Walter Palmer, members of Allen Street Church in New York City. They soon attained unusual nationwide leadership. Bishops Janes, Peck, Hamline and Simpson were all close friends of the Palmers, and in considerable measure followed their leadership.

Of the eight bishops elected in 1872 in the Methodist Episcopal Church, half — namely, Foster, Merrill, Peck and Haven — belonged to this school of thought. Bishop Peck wrote a book upon the subject of holiness entitled *The Central Idea of Christianity*, and Bishop Foster wrote one entitled *Christian Purity*. Bishop Taylor also published a volume entitled *Christian Holiness*.

Bishop W. F. Mallalieu was a strong advocate of holiness and a pronounced conservative theologically. In 1881, when James W. Bashford, later a bishop, was a young pastor in Boston, he preached a sermon on "Punishment of Sin," in which he suggested the possibility of future probation. Mallalieu preferred charges of heresy against him. The presiding elder informed the investigating committee that in his mind, after investigating what Bashford had said, Bashford had the right to preach his convictions in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and there the matter stopped. Later the two men saw seven years of association together in the Board of Bishops between Bashford's election in 1904 and Mallalieu's death in 1911.

As the controversy over holiness came into sharper focus later in the century, the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church found themselves not only divided in their personal reaction to the second blessing theory of holiness, but much more so in their judgment as to how the situation that had developed around stress upon this conception should be handled. This was chiefly because of the rise of independent holiness associations, campgrounds, publications and schools. Some bishops took the position that association with such independent projects upon the part of preachers under Methodist appointment should not be tolerated, and in some cases they went so far as to force the location of ministers who held these attachments.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the story was much the same. Bishops Key and Morrison, for instance, professed the experience and took positions supporting the holiness constituency, while Bishops Haygood and Candler generally tended to oppose them. This was despite the fact that at the time of Bishop Candler's election, he had had the strong support of advocates of the second blessing theory, and they had regarded him, largely because of his native conservatism, as fully friendly to their cause.

Bishop Key was very anxious for his wife to profess the second blessing. W. A. Swift, long an evangelist and editor in the South, has related how on one occasion Bishop Key said to him, "I have told my wife that she has gone on to perfection so long, she might as well make a profession of it, but she says it gets

people into trouble." On the other hand, the third wife of Bishop Andrew did profess the blessing of sanctification on her own motion and without particular urging upon the part of her episcopal husband.

The 1894 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South took note of the growing controversy over holiness in the episcopal address, which said, "The privilege of believers to attain unto the state of entire sanctification or perfect love and to abide therein is a well-known teaching of Methodism." But it deplored letting the profession of holiness become a source of division in the church, or leading one to sit in judgment upon other professing Christians. The address went on to say, "We deplore their teaching and methods in so far as they claim a monopoly of the experience, practice and advocacy of holiness and separate themselves from the body of ministers and disciples."

In the early years of this century, the bishops of the M. E. Church, South split sharply over the relationship of Vanderbilt University to the church, as a conflict developed between the trustees and the church and particularly a large part of the College of Bishops. Bishop Hendrix, the senior bishop, was also the president of the Board of Trustees, and he chose to stand with the chancellor and the board. Bishop Hoss, himself a former Vanderbilt professor, led the battle against the efforts of the chancellor and the trustees to divorce the university from the church as he saw it. The matter was carried eventually to the lower courts and to the Supreme Court of Tennessee. Perhaps there was never a time when the bishops of the Church South were so seriously and tragically divided, though it must be said that most of them sided with Bishop Hoss, and the 1914 General Conference gave him a strong endorsement. The university was finally lost to the church, but the church immediately began to rally to the establishment of two new universities, Emory and Southern Methodist.

Bishop Mouzon, elected in 1910, was a liberal for the day in which he lived, as over against most of the other members of the College of Bishops at that time, except Bishop Hendrix. Moreover, in 1914 when the Vanderbilt controversy came to a head, he stood with Hendrix rather than with Hoss and the overwhelming majority of the bishops. Hendrix was growing older, and Mouzon found himself quite lonely in the College, particularly after 1914, until at least one liberal came to join him as a result of the election in 1918 in the person of John M. Moore.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church some division appeared between the older bishops and the younger bishops as the era of the Social Gospel began to dawn. Matters never became too serious, however, for ever since Civil War days much of the church in the North had felt that at least some "meddling in politics" was justified. Some of the older bishops, whose emphasis had been upon the personal Gospel, did at least wonder, however, where the social emphasis of some bishops of the newer generation, like McConnell and Welch, would carry the church. The impact of the new emphasis in the new century upon the social gospel came more slowly in the Church South, but it did come. Some of the older bishops, like Candler, Denny and Darlington, were a bit leary of it, but some younger bishops, like Kern in particular, saw this as the direction of the future.

Methodism was not shaken by the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy of the 1920's to the extent that some of the other denominations were. There was, however, some division of opinion among the bishops on the issue. In the Church South, Candler, Denny, Darlington and DuBose generally leaned toward the Fundamentalist position, while Mouzon and John M. Moore leaned toward the Modernist.

In the 1920's the Ku Klux Klan had a rebirth, and in many cases its influence found its way into the churches. Bishops, like pastors and laymen, found themselves under the necessity of taking some stand with reference to the organization. As a whole the bishops were strongly set against it and saw in it an evil influence. Bishops Anderson, Luther Wilson, McConnell, Mouzon, Thirkield and E. H. Hughes all fought the Klan. Bishop McMurry, giant that he was and man of deep resentment to wrong, fought it even to the point of engaging in physical blows with one of its advocates.

One other division among the Southern bishops should be noted, and that is their choosing up sides on the matter of Methodist union. In the early years, from 1844 to about 1872, the Southern bishops as a whole were minded to have little or no dealings with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Some of them had participated personally in the 1844 Conference that divided the church. All of them had seen their beloved Southland prostrated and laid waste by the Civil War. Together they had chafed under the occupation of Southern churches by preachers appointed by Northern bishops, and the building of altar against altar throughout the South after 1864. Neither were all the Northern bishops at first too interested in union. Some of them had been superpatriots, who saw the Church South as having sold its soul, and who in some cases apparently seemed to feel that punishment should be meted out to their Southern brethren rather than mercy. At length, on both sides of the Mason-Dixon line some change in attitude began to take place, and by 1874 definite plans to heal the breach were under way. Bishops like Cranston, McDowell and Hughes began in time to take leadership, as did also Hendrix, Mouzon and John M. Moore of the Church South.

In the Church South, in particular, progress toward union was slow. The first formal test of a scheme of union came in 1924. The bishops divided sharply. Candler, Denny, Darlington, Ainsworth and Dickey took a firm stand against the union, while the other members of the episcopal college advocated it. The plan failed to be approved by the Annual Conferences.

In 1938, a second try at union was made and this time it succeeded. Leadership in the Methodist Episcopal Church was given particularly by Edwin Holt Hughes; in the Methodist Protestant Church by James H. Straughn, and in the M. E. Church, South by John M. Moore. All of the active bishops of the Church South went along with the plan, one or two of them reluctantly. Bishop Candler, the senior bishop and retired, was too feeble in health to participate in the consideration in any significant way. Bishop Collins Denny, also retired, did enter into the debate on union with alacrity and with telling argument. He wrote countless letters and articles, contacted many individuals and addressed

numerous gatherings. When the episcopal address was presented at the last General Conference of the Church South in Birmingham in 1938, he refused to sign it, taking exception to the portions of it dealing with union. At the time of the Uniting Conference in 1939, he declined being listed as one of the bishops of the new church. To the day he died he refused to take the pension to which he was justly entitled, standing nobly and logically by his convictions to the very end. When someone asked him whether he had left the church, he is said to have replied that he had not, but that rather the Methodist Episcopal Church, South had gone off and left him.

## VII

# The Bishops As Individuals

The bishops of Methodism as a body have represented a collection of individuals, all of them distinctly different. They have been elected to administer the affairs of the church, but as administrators they have differed widely. Bishop McKendree was the first to set the pattern of exact administration. He insisted upon doing everything in order, and he was a master of detail. He systematically recorded his activities in a journal and carefully kept practically all of his correspondence. An example of his extreme carefulness is the fact that at one Annual Conference he borrowed a stub pencil from a certain brother, carried it with him on his extended travels over the next twelve months, and at the succeeding session of the conference returned it with apologies to the owner.

Bishop Walden was the same type of administrator, being business-like and meticulous almost to a fault. He was often referred to as a walking encyclopedia. Bishop W. L. Harris was an administrator par excellence. For five sessions he served as the Secretary of the General Conference. For a number of years he served as Secretary of the Board of Bishops, and often he was chosen by his episcopal brethren to assume trouble-shooting assignments.

Bishops Emory, Tigert, J. N. Fitzgerald, Johnson and Wade also served as secretaries of the General Conference. Particularly in the case of Bishop Wade was this earlier service reflected in his administration. Bishops Emory and Tigert died too close to election to have their talents for administration tested. Bishop Johnson spent his entire episcopal career in Africa.

Bishop Henderson belonged to the same school of bishops, finding himself intrigued by what was then called "church efficiency," giving the most minute attention to program planning and to timing, both in his own operations and in the life of the bodies over which he presided. His desire to see the Board of Bishops operate upon what he considered an efficient pattern met with strong reaction from some of his episcopal brethren, particularly Bishop Quayle who inquired of him on one occasion, roughly and somewhat disrespectfully as he saw it, "When do we have time to spit?"

Bishop Oxnam of a later day likewise established a record of careful and systematic handling of both the affairs of the areas he administered and those of the Council of Bishops whose Secretary he was for a long period of years.

The aforementioned bishops represent a not inconsiderable number of the episcopal body who have majored in the details of administration. On the other hand, there have been other bishops who spurned such and regarded it as majoring on minors. Notable examples are Bishop Quayle, just mentioned, who had no aptitude for nor patience with details, and Bishop Sam R. Hay who carried his records largely in his hat and was notorious for neglect of his correspondence. He used to say that a lot of letters were not worth answering and that most of the others would answer themselves if one waited long enough.

Just as some bishops have been masters of detail, others have been at their

best as presiding officers. Notable examples were Bishops Merrill, E. G. Andrews and Richardson of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Bishops McTyeire, Denny and John M. Moore of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. When these bishops were in the chair of the General Conference, there was a steady hand upon the helm. The old rule that the bishops should preside in the order of seniority meant that frequently the most skilled presiding officer was not available when debate was most intense and the parliamentary situation most confusing. Some of the truly great bishops of the church have been poor presiding officers. The greatly loved and genial Bishop Kavanaugh of the Church South was never cut out for presiding, and often had matters in hopeless confusion. He remained active until his eighties and in his late years was even known to nap while in the chair, much to the chagrin and even disgust of his more staid episcopal colleagues, particularly Bishop Keener, who was without a sense of humor and was both the autocrat and the perfectionist in the episcopacy.

Bishop Waldorf had a unique method of presiding. Sometimes when he wanted to see the conference take some particular action, he would say, "I think Brother so-and-so wants to move." Then he would frame the motion. Usually the brother thus singled out would agree.

One of the chief duties of a Methodist bishop is to make appointments, and in this, too, individual bishops have differed greatly. Generally speaking, in an earlier day, the bishops were stern, sometimes to the point of being arbitrary in the making of the appointments. This was true especially in the Church South, but there were bishops in the Methodist Episcopal Church who followed the same pattern. Bishop Ames was particularly adept at this, knowing full well that in his time hardly any Methodist preacher would refuse to go to his appointment. A striking example is found in his sudden, and without consultation, appointment of the ardent abolitionist, Gilbert Haven, to Natchez, Mississippi in reaction to certain articles that, as editor, Haven had published in *Zion's Herald*. Bishop Keener of the Church South insisted that his should be the final and almost only word with reference to appointment making, and he made scant use of the cabinet. Bishop Early was so imperious in appointment making that at the General Conference charges were brought against him of maladministration. Bishop Morrison acquired such a reputation for fearlessness, if not arbitrariness, in making appointments, that the College of Bishops would frequently assign him to hold the session of conferences where a political ring was in control. He would go in, as it were, with a sledge hammer and break up the political machine. After he had done such in South Carolina one preacher said, "In the South Carolina Conference, we do not measure time B. C. and A. D., but rather, B. M. and A. M. — before Morrison and after Morrison." As time has moved on, the power of the bishop in appointment making has been hedged by new laws, and the disposition of the bishops relative to this exercise of their office has largely changed until the appointment making process in Methodism has now become something that some of our episcopal fathers would scarcely recognize.

Always, the bishops of Methodism have been called upon to do a great deal of preaching, and perhaps it is fair to say that the large majority of them have been good preachers, if not great preachers. Some, of course, have been truly great preachers. These will be discussed in another connection.

Some of the earlier bishops appear to have specialized in long sermons. Bishop Bascom at times preached for as long as two hours, as did also Bishop Soule. Bishop Kavanaugh was another of these lengthy preachers. His introductions were particularly tedious, but once he got under sail, he held his audiences spellbound and brought them to laughter and to tears. He had a mannerism by which those who were familiar with his preaching style knew that he was underway. He would reach up and begin to twitch his big nose and from then on his eloquence would pour as from an unfailing fountain. Bishop Fowler had an address on Lincoln which he often delivered and which required two and one-half hours.

A few of the bishops have been able to preach short sermons. Perhaps the record was set by Bishop Hay when he preached one night for Bishop Bascom Watts in the day when Watts was still a pastor. Hay read the letter to Philemon. Then he said cryptically, "Paul wrote that. It can't be improved upon. Rise and receive the benediction."

The temptation of the bishops, largely because they are always preaching in different places and upon special occasions, has been to concentrate upon a relatively few sermons. Bishop Leete stated that just about the total repertoire of Bishop Fowler consisted of some dozen sermons. Most of the bishops have had at least one sermon which has been a personal favorite with them, and for which they have become noted. Bishop McCabe had a lecture — not a sermon — on "The Bright Side of Life in Libby Prison," which he is said to have delivered enough times to have raised thereby \$150,000 for Church Extension.

Some of the bishops, particularly of an earlier day, were ornate in their style of preaching, and a few of them were quite profound and often over the heads of their hearers. Some of them were, perhaps, too insistent upon the use of high-sounding vocabulary. Bishop DuBose, for instance, loved to play with words and would never use a simple word if he could find a profound one or one that was little known. So marked was this habit with him that admirers sometimes pleasantly and humorously referred to him as "Bishop Verbose." He was largely a self-trained man, genuinely scholarly and utterly without guile.

The job of the bishop is not only an administrative job and a preaching job, it is also by definition a traveling job. A small book could easily be written upon the travel habits and experiences of the bishops. Bishop McKendree, for instance, was deeply attached to his horse, "Old Gray", and in his will provided specifically for his horse to be taken care of. Bishop Soule had a similar attachment to the horses which he used in his journeys. Bishop William Taylor traveled the very globe itself in the course of his long history. He had one particularly strange habit for one who traveled so extensively. He always carried with him a piece of marble a foot long which he insisted upon using as a pillow. It went with him wherever he went. Bishop John M. Moore had his own peculiar

travel habits. He was always careful of expenses and on train trips he regularly took an upper berth. Likewise, he stayed at moderately priced hotels. When a friend remonstrated with him and affirmed that a particular hotel where he was wont to stay was no longer a first class hotel, he said calmly, "When I write John M. Moore upon the register, it becomes a first class hotel." Bishop E. G. Andrews persistently refused to ride a Pullman car in order to save the church money.

Just as the bishops have differed in their administration and preaching and travel habits, so have they also differed physically. Some of them have been more than portly. Bishop Roberts, the fifth bishop to be elected, was so large that again and again the horses which he employed in traveling broke down from carrying his weight. Perhaps the largest of the bishops was Peck, who more than once broke down the bed in homes where he was entertained. Bishop Morris weighed in at two hundred thirty pounds. Other corpulent bishops were Heddle, Waugh, Goodsell, Candler and DuBose. Bishop McMurry was a giant of a man, being both heavy and tall. One of the tallest of the bishops was Mouzon, who was not only tall, but most dignified and of impressive carriage. He had a habit as he began a sermon of holding his Bible folded in his hand, facing the audience silently for a few moments while looking them steadfastly in the eye, and then quoting his Scripture lesson from memory. On one occasion he spoke at Emory University, when Bishops Paul Hardin and John Branscomb were students there. When he struck this impressive posture, John leaned over to Paul and said, "Look at him, Paul. He's already hit a home run before he's started, while little fellows like us have to lay down a bunt and run like everything even to get on first base."

Other bishops have been quite short. Bishop Candler was not only heavy but short also, so much so that his intimate friends often called him "Shorty". He sometimes said of himself, "I don't play golf because if I am close enough to the ball to hit it, I can't see it, and if I am far enough away to see it, I can't reach it." Bishops Blake and Bristol were also short and slight of build. Bishop Kern was five foot six, the exact height of John Wesley.

A striking contrast in size is afforded by the two outstanding missionary bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Bishop William Taylor was a giant of a man, being both tall and heavy. Bishop Thoburn on the other hand was the very opposite. He was quite short and slight of build and always wore a bowler hat and a long black coat that buttoned up close to his white clerical collar.

Many of the bishops have been impressive in their appearance, whether tall or short, heavy or more normal in size, thus giving rise to the common Methodist expression, "He looks like a bishop." Bishop McDowell was a striking example of a preacher whose handsome appearance would command attention in any company. Bishop Hendrix was so impressive in his appearance, particularly in the days when bishops wore tall silk hats and Prince Albert coats, that he was often spoken of "Prince Eugene", and Bishop Dickey for similar reasons was often referred to by students at old Emory at Oxford as "King James." Bishop Soule had the appearance of a born commander, and Bishop Keener was so

striking in his appearance and so stern in manner that fellow bishops, preachers, laymen and conferences all stood in constant awe of him.

Most of the bishops have paid due attention to dress, though this has not been uniformly true. Bishop Waugh was the last of the bishops to abandon the distinct and somewhat Quaker-like garb of the early Methodist preachers. Bishop Bascom paid so much attention to dress that many of the brethren of his day thought of him as something of a dandy. Apparently he never got over his early interest in dress.

At the session of the Tennessee Conference in 1818, according to Peter Cartwright, James Axley, a rugged pioneer preacher, was preaching at a sunrise service and Bascom was present and sitting near the front. He was wearing a gold watch chain with two large seals, one of which he was fingering during the sermon as the preacher inveighed against gold and costly apparel. Axley stopped and said to him sternly, "Put up that chain and quit playing with those seals and hear the word of the Lord."

Even wearing suspenders was once looked upon with disfavor by some Methodists. According to Peter Cartwright, Bishop McKendree was once presiding in a conference where formal complaints were made against a preacher for wearing gallowses. McKendree dismissed the matter by saying, "Never mind, brother, I will talk to the young man." The interesting fact was that McKendree was scarcely in position to pursue the matter as he was wearing suspenders himself. Bishop Vincent was always noted for his careful dress and particularly for the little white tie which he invariably wore.

The use of robes has become so common for bishops today that it is difficult for us to realize what a stir the question of using them created among the bishops of only a few decades ago, even as it did among the clergy in general, particularly in the church in the South. Bishop Holt, while Chaplain of Southern Methodist University in 1915, dared to introduce the use of robes in a worship service, and Bishops Hendrix and Mouzon wore robes with him in services in which they participated. Some Texas ministers threatened to take the matter to the floor of the Annual Conference under a charge of "introduction of popery". Most of the other Southern bishops of that day never became converted to the use of robes.

A few of the bishops have appeared to be somewhat indifferent to dress. A striking example is Bishop Marvin, who was not present when he was elected in 1866. Upon his arrival at the seat of the General Conference, his appearance was such that Bishop Paine saw that he received a new suit and a haircut before being formally presented. In the after years, as he gave himself with abandon to his task, he continued his habit of not paying too much attention to dress.

Most of the bishops have had hobbies, which have been for them the source of relaxation and refreshment from the strain of their responsibilities. Many of these they did not advertise to the world. Bishop Roberts was an ardent hunter, while Bishop Walden was a committed fisherman. Bishop Levi Scott had a passion for playing the violin in a day when many Methodists felt that playing a "fiddle" was sinful. Bishop Vincent had a hobby of playing croquet. Both Bishop

Paine and Bishop Warren made a hobby of astronomy, Bishop Quayle collected rare editions of the Bible, and Bishop Watkins produced woodwork. Bishop Eveland had a hobby of fishing and was killed tragically on a fishing trip when a steel rod he was using struck an electric line. Bishop Fisher collected walking sticks. Bishop A. W. Wilson, who was unusually scholarly, liked to read detective stories, and strange to say, Bishop Cannon, who always appeared cold and severe, enjoyed the comics.

Bishop Hurst had a habit of taking a bicycle ride before breakfast. Bishop Bashford made a hobby of the dictionary, and Bishop McConnell said that Bashford would get up in the middle of the night and go downstairs to look up the root meaning of a word. Bishop Foster had a hobby of working with locks and keys and had a room in his home fitted up as a locksmith's shop.

As a whole, across the years, the bishops have been a company of serious men. This has been partly because of the weight of their office, partly because of the nature and personality of some of them, and partly because of a concept of what was proper in the episcopacy that long obtained in the church. The early bishops again and again inveighed against what they termed "levity". One of the last papers written by Bishop Andrew was a brief memorandum against "levity". It was found in his pocket after his death. Bishops Hamline and Keener never countenanced any jesting or lightness when they were in the chair of a conference or otherwise in command of a situation. The same was true of Bishop Marvin. Bishop Emory weighed every word and refused to indulge in any kind of casual conversation. Yet, even in an earlier day, there were a few bishops such as Kavanaugh who saw no harm in laughter, and the day came in due time when the bishops as a whole countenanced humor and gladness to an extent which their episcopal forebears would perhaps never have understood.

In line with the seriousness with which they took life, the earlier bishops generally looked with disfavor upon various forms of amusement such as the dance, the theatre and card-playing, and other still lighter forms of diversion such as reading novels. In this position they were in line with the thinking of what they termed "old Methodism". Over a long period of time the bishops of the Church South embodied at the beginning of the *Discipline* what was termed an "Address on Worldliness" signed by them all. This remained a feature of the *Discipline* as late as 1918.

Bishop Simpson reacted strongly against a concert given by the famous Swedish singer, Jenny Lind, and condemned those who crowded the theatre to hear her. Bishop Pierce, on the other hand, confessed in a letter to his daughter, Ethel, that he greatly enjoyed seeing a circus parade in St. Louis, although he shared Methodism's opposition at the time to circuses themselves. Bishop Candler delivered his soul against the evil of the theatre and the low character of stage people as he stood one morning in McKendree pulpit in Nashville. To his surprise, and that of the congregation, a famous actress of the day, Emma Abbot, who happened to be playing in the city at the time and was present at the service, rose in her seat and interrupted the sermon to deny his allegations.

A few of the bishops have been musical. Bishop McCabe had been an

evangelistic singer in earlier days. During the Civil War he made "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" popular, and he was called upon to sing it at the funeral of Abraham Lincoln. Quite appropriately, it was sung at his own funeral. He kept his conferences singing and he himself continued singing unto the end. Bishop William Taylor also loved to stand on a street corner, sing up a crowd and then preach to them. Bishop O. P. Fitzgerald, when a parliamentary situation got tangled beyond his ability to handle it, would resort to starting a song. Bishop Clair, Sr., in his Communion Services, would sing as he distributed the elements. Bishop Marvin would often break into song at the close of a sermon. Bishop Darlington, who had a fine tenor voice, would do the same thing. Bishops Hoss, Harrell and Kennedy were authors of hymns which found their way into the *Hymn Book*.

Some of the bishops have been associated with the production of the various hymnals of the church. Asbury apparently had more than a little to do with the first hymnal, especially with the selection of the hymns. Serving on the committees appointed in earlier days to revise the *Hymnal* were Bishops Hoss, DuBose, John M. Moore, Goodsell, Cooke, Quayle, Anderson, Edwin Holt Hughes, Leete, Lester Smith, Lowe, Candler, Darlington, Hay, Frank Smith and Holt.

The Commission responsible for the latest edition of the *Hymnal* was ably chaired by Bishop Edwin E. Voigt. Associated with him in the Commission, which included a number of pastors and lay persons, were Bishops Harmon, W. R. Cannon, Frank, Franklin, Kennedy, Lord, Noah Moore and Raines.

All the bishops had their little peculiarities and idiosyncrasies. A few may be mentioned. Bishop George would never agree to sit for a portrait, feeling that to do so would involve a certain measure of vanity. Bishop Roberts was a modest man and very reticent. He would always take a back seat in meetings, and as he traveled he never identified himself, affirming that he did not want favors shown him because of his office. Bishop Hamline wanted no episcopal honors or show and insisted that his gravestone contain no indication that he had once occupied the highest office in the church. Bishop Darlington took the same position and for years the stone in the old cemetery at Frankfort, Kentucky, that marks his resting place bore only the name, "U. V. W. Darlington" and the appropriate dates. Later, friends added to the original inscription a notation that he was a bishop of the church. Bishop Soule took rigidly an Old Testament attitude with reference to eating pork.

Bishop Neely earned for himself the reputation for being particularly loquacious, appearing to feel that he ought to have something to say upon every matter up for discussion, however trivial, and he was constantly on the floor of the Board of Bishops. Bishop Blake likewise spoke quickly and frequently in the Board of Bishops. Bishop McConnell affirms that in the very first hour of Blake's membership in the body, he took the floor to reform its procedures.

Bishop Leonard had a particular aversion to red ties and he often lectured the young preachers on what he thought of a preacher who would wear one. To his amazement, on one occasion Bishop Wallace Brown, whom he had invited to

be the conference preacher, showed up wearing a red tie.

Bishops Janes, Duncan and Walden came to be thought of as all too often tense and irritable. Bishop Dobbs was the perfect gentleman and the essence of formality. He refused to use first names in a day when such usage was beginning to become common. It was his custom to call all the preachers "Doctor," regardless of whether they had a degree or not. When he was assigned to hold the North Alabama Conference, he found his own father a member of the Cabinet. He maintained even in this case his well-known formality and always addressed him as "Doctor Dobbs."

Bishop Walden for fifty years followed the habit of living on half his income and giving the other half away. Bishop Quayle all of his days took boyish delight in walking bareheaded in the rain, and the harder the rain, the better. Bishop Darlington would never say the word, "goodbye." Instead, he would clasp one's hand, look him steadily in the eye and say, "I will see you again."

Certain of the bishops became identified in the thinking of the church particularly with certain sections of the church's membership. Bishop Gilbert Haven was a strong advocate of the rights of women in the church, whereas Bishop Fowler earned for himself the reputation of being an ardent anti-feminist and clashed sharply with so prominent a person among women in the church as Frances Willard. The two of them had been friends as young people, and some reports have it that they were once sweethearts.

Also Bishop Vincent found himself opposed to woman suffrage. He took a rather odd approach to the matter, arguing that woman suffrage would deprive man of his most exalted role because, "It is his glory to represent her. To rob him of this right is to weaken both." Bishop Dickey was a leading candidate for consideration in 1918 at the General Conference of the Church South, but he took a position in opposition to rights for women which probably cost him election. He was elected four years later, however.

Bishops Berry and DuBose were strong advocates of the concerns of young people, each of them having headed the work of the Epworth League, the one in the Methodist Episcopal Church and the other in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Bishop Kern was likewise active about the concerns of young people and was the father of the Youth Caravan Movement that for a period made so significant a contribution. He also had much to do with the development of the Crusade Scholarship Program which has meant so much to youth from so many lands, and in turn to the church overseas from the United States.

Bishop Bowman, long the senior bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, because of his long-time interest in little folk, came to be known by the lovely title, "The Children's Bishop," and Bishop McTyeire, despite his mastering concerns with church structure and church law and church institutions, was so committed to the very young that his friends had written upon his gravestone on the Vanderbilt campus the words, "A leader of men and a friend of little children."

A number of the bishops in later life met themselves coming back from positions that they took earlier in their careers. Bishop Kern, as a young man at

the time of the General Conference of 1922, was among those who memorialized the conference to adopt term episcopacy. Later, in 1930, he accepted election to the episcopacy although it was for life.

Bishop Emory, in the conference of 1820 as a delegate, was for the elected presiding eldership, but when subsequently the provision for appointment by the bishop was continued, he did not let this lead him to refuse the office in 1832, as Bishop Soule had refused it in 1820 when the position he advocated did not obtain. The same was true of Bishop Hedding, elected in 1824, and Bishop Waugh, elected in 1836.

Bishop James Cannon, Jr., in the General Conference of 1914, took a prominent part in the forced retirement of Bishop A. W. Wilson. In 1934, at Jackson, Mississippi, Bishop Cannon, in turn, found himself facing an effort to force his own retirement, and he must have experienced something of the same feelings Bishop Wilson had had twenty years before. His own proposed retirement was charged with emotional overtones, related on the one hand to certain questionable activities upon his part and on the other to his strong advocacy of prohibition. The vote in Bishop Cannon's case was by roll call, and he sat upon the stage apparently unmoved as the call proceeded, keeping the score for himself in full view of the audience. When he realized that the necessary number of favorable votes had been acquired, he quietly laid down his pencil and looked forward stoically until the call of the delegates was completed.

Bishop Berry, writing in 1926, comments that the bishops of an early day generally were more reserved and more dignified than the bishops of his own day in the episcopacy. One wonders what his comment would have been in later years when many of the bishops developed the habit of calling each other by their first names, when they began to wear informal clothes, when they readily admitted interest in baseball, golf, and other sports, and when they came to be appreciated as deeply human personalities as well as dignitaries of the church.

All in all, the bishops have been a most human company. They have had their various ways of operating, their widely differing personalities and their varying weaknesses and strengths, but still generally they have remained bound together strongly as a unit by their love of the one Lord, their deep attachment to Methodism and their common devotion to a common task.

## VIII

# The Pulpit Giants

Most of the bishops of Methodism, particularly in an earlier day, were known for their preaching, and some of them were truly pulpit giants. In many cases it was their preaching that originally spotted them for consideration by the church for election to the episcopacy. Particularly was this true in a time that laid primary stress upon preaching. So usual was it for the bishops of the church to be thought of as good preachers that a common compliment paid by Methodists to those they regarded as effective preachers was to say, "He can preach like a bishop." For long years the bishop's sermon on Sunday morning of the Annual Conference session was the highlight both of the session and of the conference year, and people came for miles and filled the largest sanctuaries to hear it. Often it was deeply moving as the bishop would lead his audience to the mountain top. One often wondered how he managed to do this in the midst of the pressures of presiding in conference sessions, making appointments, holding interviews and meeting other demands. For some of us who are older, this highlight of the conference sessions of another day remains an unforgettable memory. Today, what was once known as "Conference Sunday" has largely disappeared. Most of the Annual Conferences now meet during the week, and sometimes the bishop does not preach at all, being overburdened with other responsibilities incident to conducting the conference.

While, as has been said, most of the bishops have been regarded as good preachers, it is the pulpit giants in the episcopacy whom the church has remembered most for their preaching. Perhaps the first of these that should be pointed out is Bishop Henry B. Bascom, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in 1850. There were other bishops before him who were noted for their evangelistic preaching such as McKendree or George or Roberts, but they need to be treated primarily as evangelists rather than as pulpit men. For Bascom, as for other pulpit giants coming after him, the pulpit was his continuing throne, and he was above everything else, a preacher. He had the ornate oratorical style which was popular in his day, and he moved great audiences with the spell of his eloquence. As a young man, he had difficulty finding entrance into the conference as the brethren felt he did not promise to fit the pattern of a preacher and to their way of thinking he seemed to have about him something of what they termed "worldliness." But his case was defended by Bishop McKendree, and once admitted, he made his way steadily upward in the life of the church, serving at one time the only station church in Kentucky, the one in Louisville, and at another as pastor of the famous Smithfield Street Church in Pittsburgh. For a period he served as editor of the *Quarterly Review*. In 1823, he became Chaplain of Congress in a day when it contained such oratorical giants as Henry Clay, Daniel Webster and John C. Calhoun. Henry Clay was his particular friend.

In the General Conference of 1844, he was a leader among the Southern

delegates, and in the Louisville Convention of 1845 he was chairman of the committee which perfected the plan for the organization of the Church South. It was not, however, activities such as these, but rather his widely acclaimed preaching that led to his election to the episcopacy in 1850. He did one thing that perhaps no other Methodist bishop ever did. He preached the sermon at the time of his own consecration.

Bishop Charles W. Burns had a similar opportunity to that of McKendree in Bascom's case to befriend a young ministerial candidate. The bishop happened to be serving as the conference preacher at the conference where the case for admission was up for consideration. Some misgiving was voiced as to the candidate's personal piety, and in the course of the discussion appeal was made to Bishop Burns for any word he might have to offer. He said, "I happen to know the young man. If you want to turn down one of the most promising ministerial candidates I have seen in a long time, go ahead and refuse to receive him." That settled the matter and the young man was received. In due time he became one of the strong episcopal leaders of the church.

Bishop Matthew Simpson is another of the unforgettable pulpit giants of Methodism. Born in Ohio of Methodist parentage, he entered the Pittsburgh Conference in 1833, and soon attracted attention by the strength of his preaching. After serving prominent pastorates, he was elected editor of the *Western Christian Advocate* in 1848, and in 1852 he was made a bishop of the church. From that time until his death in 1844, by sheer force of personality and gifts, he took first place among his episcopal colleagues. But while he was an effective administrator and church statesman, he was most of all a preacher. He looked like a preacher, standing straight and tall and handsome, and with piercing eyes that seemed to look into the souls of those to whom he spoke. Vast audiences gathered everywhere to hear him preach and in a period in the church life of America that represented the day of pulpit stars such as Henry Ward Beecher in America and Charles H. Spurgeon in England, Simpson did not have to take second place to any. His preaching came to deal so largely with the theme of loyalty and devotion to one's nation that particularly during and immediately after the Civil War, he was sometimes called "the evangelist of the Republic." He played numerous other roles upon the episcopal scene to which reference must necessarily be made in any attempted story of the Methodist episcopacy, but to the generations that knew him and the church that loved him, he was primarily a preacher, holding forth the word of life with a degree of effectiveness matched by few men.

Another pulpit giant in the episcopacy was Bishop Charles B. Galloway of the Church South. He was a native of Mississippi, and as a very young man he captured the attention of the entire church by the magic of his unusual preaching. When he was barely out of his twenties, he was in demand in the largest and strongest pulpits, and at the age of thirty-six he was elected to the episcopacy. He was handsome and dignified in his appearance, courtly in his manner, eloquent in his choice of words, persuasive in argument, and supremely effective in the delivery of his message. Over a period of forty years vast

audiences throughout the South and elsewhere waited avidly upon his words. He was often referred to as "the Chrysostom of Southern Methodism." His messages were polished gems of the sermonic art as it was conceived of in his day. He did not hesitate to take what were then thought of as advanced positions or to speak on what were then termed "political subjects." In so doing, at one time, he crossed swords with Jefferson Davis on the matter of prohibition, but even daring to take issue with so popular an idol, as Davis was then with much of the South, did not subtract from the high regard in which Galloway was uniformly held as a preacher and as a man.

Another pulpit giant in the episcopacy was Bishop Robert McIntyre of the Methodist Episcopal Church, now largely forgotten but in his day a preacher of tremendous power and effectiveness. Born in Scotland and coming to this country as a lad, he grew up the hard way. Eventually finding his way into the great pulpits of his day, he served some great churches such as First Church, Los Angeles, from which he was elected to the episcopacy. He was primarily a preacher, and this was what brought him to the attention of the entire church. There was much of the poet about him and about his preaching, and he himself wrote verse. Perhaps the one of his poems that proved most moving was the one which he entitled, "A Man Named Wesley Passed This Way." It is said that in the bishops' meetings he was usually lost in his own thoughts and indifferent to the considerations going on about him. It was only when he stood up to preach that he was at his best. In some respects he found the episcopacy disillusioning, and he often looked back longingly to the days when he stood as pastor in some of the great pulpits of the church.

Bishop William Alfred Quayle was another of the pulpit giants of the Methodist Episcopal Church. So eloquent a preacher was he that in time he became known as "the skylark of Methodism." There was a musical and poetic quality about his preaching and a human and emotional depth that profoundly moved audiences. Born in Missouri, he grew up as an orphan lad. He entered the Kansas Conference in 1885 and rapidly attracted nationwide attention by unusual pulpit ability. Elected to the episcopacy in 1908, he remained forever the preacher and was almost totally uninterested in the administrative responsibilities of the episcopacy.

Bishop William Frazier McDowell was another of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church particularly known as a preacher. He was tall and commanding in his appearance, with a great shock of grey hair. Especially impressive was his illuminated face and the unforgettable radiance of his countenance, particularly when it was fully aglow in some moment of high ecstasy. He was known, too, for other features of the magnificent episcopal leadership which he gave to the church over a period of thirty-three years, but most of all he was acknowledged for his preaching, and wherever he went the hungry multitudes looked up and always found themselves fed.

Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes, of later memory, also belongs in the category of master preachers. There was a deeply moving human quality about his preaching, and he had the rare ability to evoke both laughter and tears upon the

part of his audiences, He knew well the art of illustration, and drew upon everyday life to make vivid the message he sought to convey. He was a genius in the use of the well-turned phrase, the carefully chosen adjective, and the idea-packed sentence. There was a bit of rare playfulness that sometimes crept into his preaching, and he had a delightful chuckle that was frequently interspersed in what he had to say. People loved to hear him preach and his services were in constant demand everywhere. In a very real sense he may be accurately spoken of as the evangelist of Methodist Union in 1939 and only God himself can know the extent to which the magic of his deeply moving preaching made this possible.

The chief biographer of Bishop Warren A. Candler of the Church South entitled his work, *Giant Against the Sky*, and the name was by no means a misnomer. Elected from Georgia in 1898, Bishop Candler for almost forty years was the dominant figure in the life of Methodism in the South. He had been made a presiding elder at the early age of twenty-three. He was an administrator, a missionary, a statesman, and an educator, but he was primarily a preacher of unusual power. He was a short man, almost as big around as he was tall, with a giant head that sat down onto his shoulders, and great bulging, searching eyes. He had an unusually deep voice and seemed to speak from far down in his throat. He was primarily a Scriptural preacher, and he loved to preach holding his open Testament in his hand. Often he would preach from an entire passage rather than from a single text, and he was particularly gifted in illuminating the Scriptures. His remarks were keen and pungent and telling and drove his point home in an unforgettable way. He was much given to witticisms and some of his sayings practically became proverbs with his own generation and the ones that followed immediately thereafter. Ultra-conservative in thinking, he was a strong defender of what he considered "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints." He had little patience with what he thought of as religious faddists on the one hand or with social liberals on the other. He had marked mannerisms of several varieties which but served to add spice to his preaching. As a preacher, he was equally at home before a Georgia camp-meeting audience or upon the platform of some great university of the church or of the state. He is, of course, becoming only a dim memory for a diminishing number of older persons today, but all who ever sat even once under the spell of his pulpit ministry can never forget the glory of that high hour, and he will continue to live in their thoughts as one man in the pulpit who was verily a "giant against the sky". Great preacher that he was, nevertheless he was subject to moods of depression sometimes. He talked so frequently about resigning his office that one of his colleagues used to twit him about "your annual resignation." But he never carried through on his threats and completed thirty-six years of active service as a bishop, accepting retirement only because it was forced upon him by a new law adopted by the General Conference when he was seventy-seven years of age.

Bishop McDowell once characterized true Methodist preaching as beginning with experience and ending with an appeal, and such characterization fitted the preaching of all those bishops who have been here recalled.

Many other bishops of Methodism might also be listed who were gifted

occasional preachers, but those who have been mentioned were uniformly such preachers of the Word as to take front rank with other pulpit giants of other denominations in the long history of American preaching.

## IX

# The Evangelists

The first bishops of American Methodism were above all else evangelists. Asbury was a gifted church administrator and statesman, but he was primarily an evangelist. He thought in evangelistic terms, preached evangelistic sermons, constantly urged the church to evangelistic activity, and judged those who labored with him largely in terms of their evangelistic success.

Bishop McKendree was also first of all an evangelist. Converted himself under the preaching of John Easter, a noted Virginia evangelist, he kept the evangelistic emphasis unto the end of his days. Hundreds were awakened by and converted under his preaching wherever he went. As presiding elder in the Western Conference, he found himself associated with the Wilderness Revival which began in Kentucky and Tennessee in 1800, and ultimately had results reaching far beyond the borders of these then frontier states, including the birth of the Disciples Movement in Bourbon County, Kentucky, and of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Dickson County, Tennessee. This revival witnessed also the rise of the Campmeeting Movement beginning with a meeting in the woods in Logan County, Kentucky, near the Kentucky-Tennessee border, under the leadership of William and John McGee, one of them a Presbyterian and the other a Methodist. The pattern soon spread and for the next century camp-meetings were common. Bishop McKendree, like Wesley, was not only evangelistic himself, but he constantly organized for evangelism, both during his days as presiding elder and his years as bishop. The chief media of evangelism which he emphasized were the evangelistic sermon accompanied by an altar call for sinners to repent and believe; the faithful use of the Methodist class as a provision for watchcare and spiritual development; and the use of the camp-meeting with the goal of at least one camp-meeting in each presiding-elder's district. Throughout his episcopacy, McKendree remained the field marshal of the evangelistic forces of Methodism. In Annual and General Conferences, he kept this emphasis constantly before the church from the beginning of his ministry unto its end. He saw Methodism grow from a mere handful of members to a church of strength, largely because of its fervent and untiring evangelism.

The third bishop of Methodism, Bishop George, is largely forgotten today, but he deserves at least passing mention in any consideration of the evangelists among the bishops. Virginia born, he also, like McKendree, was converted under the preaching of the same John Easter. He took not only an active part, but also a leading part in the revival movement that was sweeping the church in the early years of the nineteenth century, and was one of its leading evangelists with hundreds converted under his preaching. Bishop George was perhaps the most emotional among the early bishops of the church, and preached always with deep feeling and often with tears in his eyes, so much so that in his day he was familiarly known as "the weeping prophet".

Bishop Hamline of Ohio, elected in 1844 by the last General Conference of

the undivided church, is generally thought of as a church lawyer and as the outstanding advocate of the idea of an all supreme General Conference, and is remembered largely because of his position on the issues which split the church at that time and his forceful participation in the floor debates. But, he himself probably would have preferred to be remembered first of all as an evangelist. This represented a primary interest for him. He was particularly effective as a revivalist and a camp-meeting was his delight. One of his biographers says, "We doubt if any man in the Methodist Episcopal Church labored more devotedly or preached more sermons in revival meetings than he during the eight years of editorial life he spent in Cincinnati from 1836 to 1844." He was particularly effective in exhortation and in securing response to his evangelistic appeals.

Bishops John Early and H. H. Kavanaugh, elected by the Church South in 1854, both deserve to be classed among the evangelists. At the time of his election, Bishop Early was a Publishing Agent, known particularly for his business acumen and leadership in church affairs, and as a bishop he was known for his sternness and seeming arbitrariness. But in his beginning ministry, he was known as an evangelist almost unmatched among his brethren. In a single meeting in Virginia he witnessed a thousand professions of faith. One of his biographers says, "It is generally conceded that he traveled more, had more souls converted under his ministry, and received more persons into the church than any of his contemporaries.... probably more ministers were converted under his preaching than can be claimed by any man in America."

Bishop Kavanaugh was above all else the evangelist. He made a name for himself in his early ministry, primarily by his evangelism, and election to the episcopacy did not result in any change in him in this particular. His messages as he visited in the churches were almost altogether evangelistic even though the occasion of the visit might represent something so formal as a church dedication. His Annual Conference sessions took on more of the flavor of a revival meeting than that of a gathering for the transaction of business. And his services were in continual demand at camp-meetings in a day when the camp-meeting was at the summit of its popularity throughout the land. His Irish heritage came through in his witty remarks; there was a sparkle in his eye; his ponderous frame commanded attention; and these together with his message, born out of the overflow of his rich spiritual experience, all served to make him the popular evangelist that he was to the end of his days.

Bishop Enoch M. Marvin of the Church South likewise takes a front place among the evangelists in the episcopal ranks. Missouri born, his evangelistic effectiveness brought him as a very young man to the pastorate of great churches, such as Centenary, St. Louis. During the Civil War he became Superintendent of Chaplains of the Confederate Army, and his evangelistic activities among the soldiers resulted in the conversion of hundreds. His fame in this regard spread throughout the South and had much to do with his election to the episcopacy in 1866. As a bishop he continued his effective evangelism, and no man in the Church South in his day was more sincerely revered or more greatly loved. He became something of an uncanonized saint in the thinking of many,

and the time was when in many devout Southern Methodist homes there was a tendency to name one of the sons "Marvin" just as devout Methodists for a century had been naming one of their sons "Wesley".

One of the great evangelists among the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church was Bishop Isaac W. Joyce, elected from the Cincinnati Conference in 1888. His ministry had been spent largely in and around Cincinnati, and it was his evangelistic effectiveness that in all probability accounted for his election. As a bishop he suffered from something of an inferiority complex in the presence of his episcopal brethren, some of whom he sincerely felt were much more gifted than he. He used to say to them on occasion, "God gives me something, too. He gives me souls." And this was true, for he had converts wherever he went. The end came for him as the result of a stroke which came while he was preaching a holiness sermon in the pulpit of the Red Rock Camp Meeting in Minnesota. When the stroke came, he had just said, "Brethren, I have preached this glorious Gospel around the world and everywhere it has the same blessed effect."

Bishop Charles C. McCabe, who belongs among the evangelists, was elected a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1896. The election did not come until the fifteenth ballot and this was the first election of that General Conference. It appears that there was considerable maneuvering to prevent any election. Also, apparently, at least some of the bishops did not welcome the election of McCabe, although this cannot be established with finality. He was an evangelist turned Church Extension Secretary. During the Civil War he had been an army chaplain who acquired considerable note. As a bishop, he sang and preached his way through, though many complained of what they regarded as the ineffectiveness of his administrative performance.

Bishop Henry Clay Morrison, elected by the Church South in 1898, was also an evangelist of note. Born in Tennessee, most of his ministerial life was spent in Kentucky in the Louisville Conference, which he joined in 1865. His evangelism soon won for him the leading pulpits of that conference and in time the pastorate of First Church, Atlanta, and the Missionary Secretaryship of the Church South. As a bishop, Morrison acquired some reputation for being arbitrary and dictatorial and sometimes charges were preferred against his administration, but they were generally not sustained. So far as he himself was concerned, he counted it a privilege above all else to play the continuing role of an evangelist. He kept a record of the names of the persons converted under his ministry and the number totalled beyond eight thousand.

Bishops of a later day particularly known for their evangelism were Darlington, Cushman, Selecman, Arthur J. Moore and W. Angie Smith. Bishop Moore had been a professional evangelist in his beginning ministry, and after his retirement he returned to his first love, holding evangelistic meetings tirelessly until well into his eighties. Bishops Selecman, Cushman and Angie Smith were not only evangelists themselves, but each in turn gave leadership as President of the Board of Evangelism.

## X

# The Saint Johns

Methodist bishops, like all Methodist preachers, are called to be first of all good men. As a whole the bishops have been men of basic integrity, men who are well intentioned, men of devotion, and men committed to high ideals. They have not been perfect men, and some of them have had serious faults and weaknesses. Some have been wilful and arbitrary. Some have been impatient and domineering at times. Some have been vain and selfish. All of them have had to fight continually the temptations which high office carries with it. Nevertheless, as a whole they have been basically good men.

A few of the bishops have attained above all else a reputation for goodness. They have sometimes been called "the St. Johns" of the episcopacy, both by their brethren in the episcopal ranks and by others in the church who knew them well. Those whom we shall mention are bishops who belonged to an earlier age in the history of the church. This is not to suggest that equally saintly men in the best sense of the word are not to be found in the ranks of the later bishops, but wisdom dictates letting at least a sufficient number of years go by and the perspective of time to operate before so lofty a judgment be expressed concerning any individual.

We begin this category with Bishop Richard Whatcoat, the third bishop of the church. As a younger man, Whatcoat made a deep impression upon Wesley by his piety and devotion, and Wesley chose him as one of the two elders whom he ordained for service in the American Church. In 1787, Wesley directed the church in America to elect Whatcoat a bishop, which the church declined to do, not from any lack of appreciation of Whatcoat but as an expression of its determination not to be dictated to even by so revered a person as Wesley. In 1800, by a close vote, it did elect Whatcoat, at the age of sixty-four, and he served six years before death overtook him. He appears to have been a humble man, seeking nothing for himself and willing to spend, and he spent in the service of his Lord. He did not have administrative strength, nor was he disposed to assert himself strongly. During the days of his episcopacy he was completely overshadowed by the stronger and more self-assertive Asbury, but he took no exception to this. He professed entire sanctification, and his major theme was holiness. When he died, Asbury wrote of him, "A man so uniformly good I have not known in Europe or America." He was the first of the bishops of American Methodism to pass to the life eternal.

Another of the St. Johns of the episcopacy was William X. Ninde, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1884. He had been pastor of a number of great churches, including Central Church, Detroit, which he served twice. At the time of his election, he was the president of Garrett Biblical Institute. But, though he was known as a pastor and as an educator, he was known above all else for his goodness. He had a benign countenance, and W. V. Kelley in his book, *The Illuminated Face*, wrote, "The way to approximate a benignity of ex-

pression like that on the face of William Xavier Ninde is to have a heart like his." The colorful Bishop Warren A. Candler, who as an unreconstructed Southerner was never too sure of Northern sainthood, spoke of him as having "the fervent piety of an apostle." Bishop Ninde used to say constantly to everyone he met, "Brethren, pray for me that I may be a better man." He talked little about himself or his experiences and simply lived his faith. He was forever seeking to go on to perfection, and he used to affirm, "Holiness is the sweetest word in the Bible to me." At his funeral service, Bishop E. G. Andrews spoke of what he called "the trained impassivity of his countenance," and in a memorial tribute, Bishop Hurst spoke of "the serenity of his mind" and the "reposefulness of his manner." In literal fulfillment of the promise of the Scriptures, "He giveth his beloved sleep," Bishop Ninde died quietly in his sleep on January 3, 1901.

Bishop David S. Doggett of Virginia, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in 1866, likewise belongs in the category of the bishops known above all else for their goodness. He had been pastor in Richmond during the terrible Civil War days when Richmond was under seige. He was a modest, retiring, almost reticent man, and his election came as somewhat of a surprise to him, and he assumed the office with considerable misgivings as to his own ability to meet its demands. While his administration as a bishop gave satisfaction, it was primarily as a person of the highest Christian character that he was best known and most admired in his day. To those who knew him, he was in very truth a godly saint. Bishop Paine, the senior bishop of the Church South, wrote of him, "He has been constantly growing in my confidence and love, until my admiration for his rare endowments as a preacher has been equalled by my high respect for him as a high-toned gentleman and devout Christian." On his death-bed, Bishop Doggett said quietly, "I claim to have lived above reproach as a minister of the Gospel." Those who knew him saw in these words no presumptuous boasting, but a simple statement of fact upon the part of one who had humbly lived before them an exemplary life.

Mention should be made here of Bishop John C. Granbery of Virginia, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in 1882. For long years, because of his quiet devotion and gentle life, he was known among Southern Methodists as "the beloved disciple." After some years of service in the pastorate, he became a teacher of preachers at Vanderbilt and was elected from this position. He was a life-long sufferer from pain, but never complained. Before his election, Bishop McTyeire said of him, "Granbery is not much talked of now for one of our new bishops, but when the church gets to praying, they will think of him." In the episcopal address of 1910, Bishop Hendrix spoke of him as one "who was for so long a time-exposure of his ascended Lord."

Bishop Oscar P. Fitzgerald of the Church South is also to be remembered among the "St. Johns" of the episcopacy. After a long period of significant service in California when the state was young, and twelve years as editor of the *Christian Advocate*, he was elected bishop in 1890 at the age of sixty-one. His portrait, still hanging in the chapel of the Assembly at Monteagle, Tennessee, where he had a summer home and where he died, appears to be that of a gentle

soul with a lighted face. This is the way the Church South thought of him. He was an exceedingly conscientious man, so much so that he would not write a business letter on Sunday. He would, however, write what he called a "love letter", such as a personal letter to a Christian friend. Many devout people of his generation who did go so far as actually to write letters on Sunday, for conscience sake would wait until Monday to mail them, and he doubtless followed this custom with reference to his "love letters." He was a man of much prayer and he gave himself constantly to the ministry of intercession. When Bishop Seth Ward went out to Japan on what proved to be his last episcopal journey, Bishop Fitzgerald wrote him, "I have followed you with my affection and prayers since you left Nashville, and you have not traveled beyond my love and prayer for a day since that time." Bishop John M. Moore said of him, "His appointments were not made; they just grew. He had not the elements ordinarily expected of a bishop, but he had all the qualities of a great Christian."

All the bishops of Methodism in their ordination vows accepted for themselves the goal of Christian perfection so much stressed by Wesley. But all have not laid equal emphasis upon the doctrine nor interpreted it in the same way. Not a few have made high claims for themselves in the realm of religious experience, and have urged others to seek the same high experience. But all, whatever their differences in interpretation, have agreed that the one goal for every Christian must forever be, to love God with all one's heart and to love one's neighbor as himself.

The bishops of the present day would, of course, shy away from being termed "St. Johns," and those of another day, such as the ones who have been mentioned, would immediately deny that such a term might appropriately be applied to them. But the church itself has always felt across the years that there have been some persons in the episcopacy, in the general ministry and in the laity for whom this designation is not inappropriate. Not too much store is set in our day of stress and strain upon milder types of goodness, but perhaps the world still needs, as always, a few persons who may properly be thought of as belonging in the ancient category of the saints.

## XI

# The Church Statesmen

A relatively few of the bishops fall into the category of church statesmen in the sense of being architects of church structure and thus giving direction to the church both of their own day and of the future. The breed of the church statesman has never been a large one.

Bishop Asbury was himself the original church statesman of Methodism in the United States. Although he had the able assistance of persons like John Dickins, Freeborn Garretson and Jesse Lee, the evidence of his guiding hand in the early organization of Methodism in America is to be seen on every side as one studies the record of these beginning days. His position in the organizing conference of 1784, that he would not accept consecration as a superintendent without election by the conference although Wesley had ordered that he be so consecrated, automatically established the principle of the supremacy of the conference in American Methodism. His position with reference to confining the administration of the sacraments to ordained ministers triumphed over the position of those persons in the church inclined to take such matters into their own hands and became the general policy of Methodism for years to come. His position with reference to the final authority of the bishop to make the appointments triumphed upon the occasion of the first schism in the church in 1792, when James O'Kelly and advocates of the privilege of appeal left the fellowship. Apparently Asbury had much to do with the development of the presiding eldership and with the plan for a delegated General Conference. Sometimes he lost the battle, as he did in his effort in 1789 for the creation of a Council which, in effect, would govern the church. He was exceedingly adroit in the way in which he sought to achieve structural change. Sometimes he called a caucus for consultation prior to a conference at which a particular matter was due to be considered. Sometimes he worked through others, and sometimes he took the floor himself, making motions and engaging in floor debate in an effort to see such motions pass. Suffice it to say that the influence of Asbury is still indelibly written into Methodist structure though almost two centuries have passed since he finished his course.

Bishop William McKendree picked up where Asbury left off in typing the organization of Methodism in its early days. His own episcopacy and that of Asbury overlapped for only eight years, and when Asbury died in 1816, McKendree became the leading figure so far as determining church structure and functioning was concerned. It was McKendree who in 1812 first introduced the idea of an episcopal address. He did this without consulting Asbury, and Asbury took strong exception to it. It contained only nine hundred words.

In 1816, McKendree, being the only bishop, again presented an episcopal address which was referred to the appropriate committees. In 1820, he presented a similar written communication to which Bishops George and Roberts made oral supplements. Through 1824 the addresses bore only the signature of Bishop

McKendree. In the General Conference of 1840, the first formal extended address, signed by all the bishops, is recorded for the first time as a part of the *Journal*. According to scholars, this address appears to have come from the pen of Bishop Soule. There is a tradition that Bishop Soule was also the author of the communications of 1828, 1832 and 1844, though this has not been verified. In 1836, there was no communication from the bishops so far as the record shows.

There was also no episcopal address given at the tense 1848 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Instead, the bishops chose to bring to the attention of the General Conference at different stages in the proceedings any matter on which they felt compelled to speak.

Normally each episcopal address has been written by a different bishop and read by him to the General Conference, after consultation with and approval by the entire episcopal body. Sometimes the episcopal addresses have been unusually lengthy, especially in late years. That read by Bishop Kern in 1952 was so long that when, after he had been reading for one hour, he read in some connection the words of Matthew 26:46, "Rise, let us be going," the whole General Conference to his surprise broke into laughter.

It was Bishop McKendree who devised the method of calling the name of each preacher pursuant to the passage of his character by the Annual Conference and having him speak of his work and Christian experience. This method was followed faithfully in Methodist conferences for the next century and more. It was Bishop McTyeire who some years later added the feature of reporting certain statistical data, including members received and finances raised, in connection with such reports. As Methodist conferences grew in size and agenda demands increased, this open conference method of reporting had to be laid aside.

McKendree also began the practice of making use of the cabinet and was the first bishop to insist upon parliamentary procedures in conducting conference business. In 1820 to 1824, it was McKendree who took a lead in the final defeat of a measure at first approved by the 1820 conference that would have made the presiding eldership elective. His influence, like that of Asbury, is still to be observed in certain basic features of Methodist structure.

Bishop Joshua Soule, elected first in 1820 when he declined consecration and again in 1824, was a church statesman par excellence. Church structure was his major forte all of his days. He was a presiding elder at the age of twenty-three. When he was only twenty-seven years of age, he was the author in 1808 of the *Restrictive Rules* which still represent the heart of the constitution of the church. He was in the midst of every General Conference battle which he felt threatened the structure of the church. He was a strict constructionist to the core and whatever the law said, as he understood it, was always final for him. His greatest test came in the General Conference of 1844. He was a Northern man, coming out of the state of Maine originally and then residing for twenty-two years as a bishop in Ohio, having his home at Lebanon. He did not favor slavery and never himself owned a slave. But as he saw it, the General Conference of that year ignored the constitution, exceeded its authority, and rejected the

guaranteed rights of the episcopacy. Accordingly, in 1845, when the Methodist Episcopal Church, South was organized, he appeared at the organizing conference in Louisville and offered to identify himself with that church and was, of course, gladly accepted as its senior bishop. He removed to Nashville, established his home there, was able to perform active service until about 1852 and died in 1867.

Bishop Holland N. McTyeire was in many respects the chief molder of church structure in the Church South in the period between 1866 and 1889. He was the ardent proponent of laity rights, a radical departure for that day. In this period, he gave strong leadership in improving educational standards for the ministry and to numerous adjustments in the law of the church designed to make the church more effective.

Another bishop who belongs to the category of church statesmen is Bishop John M. Moore. Kentucky-born, but spending most of his ministerial life in Texas, Bishop Moore had unusual educational advantages for the day in which he lived, studying at Yale, Leipzig and Heidelberg. He held a Doctor of Philosophy degree from Yale. He was ordained during his student days in the east by Bishop Fowler of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was a little man physically, but a giant of a man intellectually. He had about him the poise, the calmness, the firmness and the self-assurance of the genuine scholar. He possessed a keen and perceptive mind. He was first elected a delegate to the General Conference of 1906, and after that he was present at each General Conference, either as a delegate or a bishop, through 1948. Early in his career he began to put forth vigorous efforts beamed at reforms in church structure, and the records of these succeeding General Conferences bear continuing testimony to the important part he always played both as delegate and as bishop. His chief role so far as church structure was concerned was played in the developments which brought about Methodist union in 1939. He was definitely one of the chief architects of the union, and certainly the strongest influence in bringing about union so far as the Church South was concerned. One of the secrets of Bishop Moore's effectiveness as a church statesman was the fact that he always did his homework and did it thoroughly. He never went to a meeting unprepared. Always he had in the inner pocket of his coat a paper on which he had written out suggested possible procedures. When things got into confusion and a committee found itself floundering, the bishop would quietly bring his paper out of his pocket and present it to the body. It would often then become, in its entirety, the paper finally adopted, or it would become something of a basic motion which the group would amend and modify as it saw fit.

When one recalls Bishop Moore as one of the architects of Methodist union, he must inevitably recall also Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Bishop James H. Straughn of the Methodist Protestant Church. When union was finally approved in 1939 in Kansas City, the three bishops joined hands to form a living, unforgettable symbol of the union. Bishop Hughes was not so much an architect of the church union as he was its evangelist. Bishop Straughn was both. Much of the important contribution

which he made was backstage and without fanfare. The story of it is preserved in his interesting small book, *Inside Methodist Union*.

Another specialist in church structure of a later day was Bishop Costen J. Harrell. While he was a preacher of strength, and the gifted author of several books, at the same time he was greatly interested in the writing of church law, particularly those sections of law referring to the local church, church finance and stewardship and the jurisdictional system. It would be an interesting exercise for anyone who knew the whole story to go through the *Discipline* of 1964, the last of The Methodist Church, and simply put a check mark in the margin beside those paragraphs where the evidences of the hand of Bishop Harrell are to be seen. The number would be most significant. As is to be expected in the case of a legal mind like his own. Bishop Harrell was a perfectionist, dotting every "i" and crossing every "t," and always fully sure of himself. So meticulous was he that in submitting manuscripts for publication, he always instructed the editors not to change so much as a comma without his permission.

As The Methodist Church moved into union with the Evangelical United Brethren Church in 1968, again there was needed the service of those who major in church structure, and the bishops furnished their proper portion of the Commission on Union; but this is another story to be told when some day the story of the present church is written.

## XII

# The Church Lawyers

Close to those bishops who have had so large a part in writing the law of Methodism are those who have majored upon interpreting the law. All bishops, by the very nature of their office, have necessarily had to be interpreters of the law, but there have been some who have been particularly adept at this, and these the church has thought of primarily as church lawyers. On the other hand, there have been a few of the bishops who found themselves almost totally at sea when it comes to interpreting the law and who have had to seek the help of some of their more legal-minded brethren. Normally those bishops who have been masters of church law have likewise been masters of parliamentary law.

Bishops Soule and McTyeire, who have already been mentioned, were church lawyers as well as law writers. Bishop McTyeire in 1870, at the request of the Southern bishops, prepared a *Manual of the Discipline*, which included something of a commentary upon the law, a summary of rules of order to be observed in the various types of conferences, and the legal decisions rendered by the College of Bishops. This original *Manual* was updated and reissued from time to time and for long years was required study for every preacher in the Church South.

Bishop Osmon C. Baker, elected in 1852, was one of the most outstanding early church lawyers of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1860 he prepared a *Guide Book for the Administration of the Discipline*. It dealt with such matters as membership, conferences, ministers, church trials, church property, ministerial support and rules of order.

Bishop Merrill, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1872, also was a specialist in church law. In 1885 he wrote *A Digest of Methodist Law*, which went through several editions and was revised as further General Conference action required. He was sometimes called by his contemporaries "the John Marshall of the episcopacy." Throughout his episcopal career he carried "a great sorrow," which his biographers mention but do not identify.

Bishop E. G. Andrews, elected in 1872, was a church lawyer par excellence and an able parliamentarian. He was usually the bishop chosen to preside or to sit beside the presiding bishop when the situation in the General Conference was especially tangled. Even after he retired at the age of seventy-nine, the active bishops would often have him sit beside them for reinforcement. On one such occasion, Bishop McDowell announced, "I will occupy the chair. Bishop Andrews will preside."

Bishop Thomas B. Neely also deserves to be mentioned among the church lawyers. In 1892, twelve years before he was elected, he published his book, *The Governing Conference in Methodism*, which is still one of the finest studies of the General Conference ever produced. Bishop Neely knew and loved the law of the church. Elected late in life, he was somewhat taken aback with his first episcopal assignment, which was to Latin America. He said with some

amazement, "They made a missionary of me." He never proved popular as a bishop, nor was he too well received by his episcopal colleagues. His episcopal experience involved more than a little disappointment for him.

Bishop Richard J. Cooke of the Methodist Episcopal Church was also a specialist in church law. He wrote several books in this field and numerous articles for the press. For a number of years he was the Book Editor of the church. He was the only white bishop elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church from one of its Southern Conferences, the Holston. His years of episcopal service were relatively brief.

Other outstanding church lawyers among the Methodist Episcopal bishops were Hamline, J. N. Fitzgerald and W. L. Harris. It was Bishop Harris who in 1875 first collected the rulings of the Board of Bishops and printed them for the private use of the bishops.

An outstanding church lawyer of the M. E. Church, South was Bishop John J. Tigert. He was a scholar of the first rank, and served for some years as a professor in Vanderbilt and as editor of the *Quarterly Review*. His monumental work in the field of church law is his *Constitutional History of American Episcopal Methodism*, published at the beginning of the century. It is still an invaluable resource for all who would fully understand Methodist polity.

Another outstanding episcopal lawyer of the Church South was Bishop Collins Denny, elected in 1910. He revised the *Manual of the Discipline* first written by Bishop McTyeire. Church law was his major and for almost thirty years the Church South looked to him with great respect for legal guidance. It did not follow him in the end, however, when at the time of the General Conference of 1938 he argued that Methodist union had not been legally adopted by the vote cast in the previous Annual Conference sessions. The then new Judicial Council rejected his contention, making one of its first decisions also one of its most momentous. The valiant old bishop, then eighty-four years of age, took his defeat in his last legal battle in the church he had loved and served so long with the majestic calmness and self-control that had uniformly marked his long ministry.

Other gifted church lawyers of the Church South were Bishops Keener, A. W. Wilson, McMurray and Peele. Bishop Peele was a studious and quiet man, who reached his decisions quite deliberately. The astute Bishop McConnell on one occasion paid him high compliment when he said, "When I find myself differing from Peele on a question of law, I always stop to take at least a second thought regarding my conclusion."

Bishop Charles H. Fowler was not one of the great legal minds of the episcopacy, but on one occasion he made a shrewd observation upon Methodist law, and particularly upon the rationale back of its development. He said, "Methodism means always doing the best possible thing."

## XIII

# The Educators

A large number of the bishops of Methodism had some connection with the educational institutions of the church. Fifty-five of them were serving in such institutions in some capacity at the time of their election. A number of institutions furnished more than one addition directly to the episcopal ranks. Bishops Bowman, Edwin Holt Hughes, McConnell, Grose and Oxnam were all elected from DePauw, formerly Indiana Asbury, and Bishop Simpson had been president of the same school earlier in his career. Bishops Foster, Hurst, Werner and Holloway were elected from Drew; Bishops Bashford and Welch from Ohio Wesleyan; Bishops E. O. Haven and Flint from Syracuse; Bishops Eveland and Corson from Dickinson; and Bishops Ninde and Loder from Garrett. Southern institutions from which more than one person was elected to the episcopacy were Emory with Bishops Pierce, Candler and Watkins, and later Bishop William R. Cannon, elected in the United Methodist Church; Vanderbilt with Bishops Granbery, Hoss and Denny; Southern Methodist with Bishops Boaz, Dobbs and Selecman; Millsaps with Bishops Murrah and Finger; and Emory and Henry with Bishops Waterhouse and Hunt. Some twenty-three other Methodist institutions saw one of their administrators or faculty members elected to the episcopacy. All the bishops elected in the Germany Central Conference were president of the seminary at the time of election.

A number of the bishops who were not elected to the episcopacy directly from positions in an educational institution did have connections with such institutions earlier in their ministry, serving either as teachers, agents or administrators. Included in this number are Bishop Bascom, who taught at Augusta College in Kentucky and also for a period was president of Transylvania; Bishop Doggett, who taught at Randolph-Macon for some years; Bishop Levi Scott, who in earlier years taught at Dickinson Grammar School; Bishop Simpson, who taught at Allegheny; Bishop W. L. Harris, who taught at Ohio Wesleyan; Bishop Warren, who taught at Armenia Seminary; Bishop Peck, who taught seven years at Troy Academy; Bishop E. G. Andrews, who taught at Oneida Seminary and was also principal for eight years, and a number of other bishops as well.

Among the bishops elected in later years who had some connection with educational institutions in the earlier years of their ministry are Bishop Mouzon, who taught briefly at Southwestern; Bishops Kern and Dobbs, who had teaching careers at Southern Methodist; Bishop Willis King, who was president of Gammon, and Bishop Ensley, who taught at Boston.

A number of bishops after retirement have served for a period as visiting professors in Methodist educational institutions. These include Bishops McConnell, Pickett, Harrell, Harmon, Paul Martin, William C. Martin, Pope and J. O. Smith. Bishop Boaz, after retirement, served for years as financial agent for Southern Methodist University and cultivated literally millions of

dollars of support for the institution.

At least three of the bishops at one time in their ministry held important posts in the field of secular education. Bishop Kavanaugh was for two years Superintendent of Public Instruction in Kentucky. Bishop O. P. Fitzgerald occupied for a time the same position in California, and it was during his administration that the University of California was founded. Bishop Walden was for a time State Superintendent in Kansas. Bishop Francis Burns, the first Negro bishop, was a teacher in his home community in New York State before he entered the ministry. He is said to have been the first Negro teacher of white youth. He was elected in 1858 and put in charge of the work in Liberia.

Not only have a number of the bishops been elected from the presidency of an educational institution or with some experience connected with such institutions as part of their earlier ministry, but in addition a number of them, once elected to the episcopacy, have majored upon and made significant contribution in the field of higher education.

Bishop McTyeire, elected by the Southern Church in 1866, did not come into the episcopacy directly from the educational world but from an editorship. Very early in his episcopal career, he sensed that although the church had a number of educational institutions of various kinds and quality, chiefly owned by Annual Conferences, it did need provision for theological education and for a great central university. Quietly, persistently, and against some severe opposition, he began to move toward this end. Finally, in 1873, he saw the beginning of Vanderbilt University. Though there were earlier steps, the actual inauguration of the University was made possible largely because of a substantial gift made by Cornelius Vanderbilt of New York, which had been secured as a result of the efforts of Bishop McTyeire. In his approach to Commodore Vanderbilt, the bishop had the advantage of the fact that Mrs. Vanderbilt was a cousin of Mrs. McTyeire, and he himself had received her into the church as a child in Mobile, Alabama. In making the gift, Commodore Vanderbilt specified that it be subject to the condition that Bishop McTyeire be the President of the Board of Trust, that he occupy a house rent free upon the campus, and that he have, in effect, a personal veto upon the actions of the Board unless overridden by a three-fourths vote. For the next twenty years, Bishop McTyeire was the almost totally dominating force in the life of the University. In the most literal sense of the word, he made the University what it was.

His last days of illness were spent on the campus he loved so greatly, and as he came toward the end he gave detailed instructions regarding his funeral and burial. He said, "Bury me in something I have preached in," and he asked that his grave be dug by laborers who worked on the campus, and that it be filled by some of the students. He asked that there be no discourse and that only the ritual of the church be used. Three months later, as he had indicated his preference to be, there was a memorial service in the University chapel at which Bishop Keener gave the main address.

Another example of a bishop's giving a university to a church is found in Bishop John F. Hurst of the Methodist Episcopal Church, elected in 1880.

Bishop Hurst takes front rank among the scholars of Methodism and will be discussed in that connection at another point. But he also takes front rank among Methodism's practical educators. In 1888, Washington became his place of episcopal residence. Soon after moving there he began to sense the need for a great university under the sponsorship of the church in the nation's capitol, and he began to sell his dream to others. As a result of a successful and tireless person-to-person canvass for funds in Washington itself, he was able to purchase the ninety acres which constituted the original campus. In the spring of 1891, he saw the organization of the Board of Trustees. The project received commendation by the General Conference of 1892. He was elected Chancellor in 1891 and remained in this office until forced to resign in 1902 due to illness. These years witnessed rapid and significant developments, and American University remains today as the enduring monument of Bishop Hurst.

Emory University at Atlanta, established in 1914, owes much to the personal efforts of Bishop Warren A. Candler. With the loss of Vanderbilt, the 1914 General Conference turned to the establishment of Emory and of Southern Methodist to compensate for the loss. A generous gift by Asa Candler of Coca-Cola fame, brother of the bishop, helped greatly in getting the University underway. In addition, Bishop Candler was successful in securing the support of other generous Methodists both in Georgia and throughout the South. For some years he served as Chancellor of the University and in time the Theology School was named for him. His bronze bust in the Central Hall of the theology school serves as a continuing reminder of how much both the University and the church are indebted to him.

Bishop Henry W. Warren, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1880, had much to do with the growth and development of five schools. His first episcopal residence was Atlanta. There he took effective leadership in the development of Clark University, an interest which he sustained throughout his life until his death in 1912. His formation of a partnership with Elijah H. Gammon resulted in the gift of funds for the establishment and development of Gammon Seminary. Within a year of his assignment to Atlanta, Bishop Warren also founded Morristown Seminary, now Morristown College, at Morristown, Tennessee. Bishop Warren's home in the later years of his life was in Denver, Colorado, where he had much to do with the development of the University of Denver and of Iliff Seminary. Mrs. Warren was a woman of considerable inherited wealth and she and the bishop were among the church's most liberal supporters of institutions of higher education.

A number of the bishops have had educational institutions named for them. Bishop John Emory, elected in 1832 and living to see only three years of episcopal service, had two colleges named for him, each of which is now moving rapidly toward the completion of a century and a half of service — Emory in Georgia, and Emory and Henry in the Holston Conference. Other bishops having schools named for them were McKendree, Soule, Paine, Hamline, Baker, Haven, Clark, Walden, Simpson, Thomson and Wiley. A few of these institutions are now gone, but the majority still continue to serve. Two independent institutions,

Asbury College and Seminary at Wilmore Kentucky, and Taylor University at Upland, Indiana, are also named for Methodist bishops.

The bishops who have been mentioned thus far among the educators of the church have all been related in one way or another to educational institutions. But in any adequate listing of the truly great educational leaders of the church, another name must be added of one who was not connected with the campus pattern of education. This is the name of Bishop John H. Vincent, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1888. At the time of his election, he was the General Secretary of the Sunday School Union. All his days he remained strongly committed to education for the rank and file membership of the church from childhood to age, and he was most ingenious in devising ways and means to make this possible. He was one of the leaders of the International Sunday School Association, and was chairman of the committee that brought into being in 1872 the Uniform Lessons. In 1874, he was one of the founders of Lake Chautauqua Assembly, which had untold influence upon the religious life of the entire land for long years. To the end of his days, he was largely the determining figure in its program offerings. As a by-product of Chautauqua, there was developed the Chautauqua Institution which carried educational and cultural advantages to remote towns. For years the annual Chautauqua was an anticipated event in the life of almost every American town. The bishop was also responsible for the development of reading courses through which individuals could carry forward a program of self-improvement. He had a fondness for liturgy in a day when such was not common among Methodists. Bishop Vincent was not himself a school man. He was very largely self-taught, studying constantly at home, in hotel rooms, and on Pullman cars, but his influence in the teaching of multiplied thousands probably remains unmatched in the history of Methodism or of any other church. Some of the patterns which he helped to establish are still being followed by all the denominations though he himself has been gone now for better than half a century.

Bishop Atkins of the Church South had a similar interest to that of Bishop Vincent. At the time of his election in 1906 he, too, was a secretary of Sunday School work. Like Bishop Vincent, he wrote books in the field of religious education and helped establish teacher and pupil training programs. And as Bishop Vincent helped to establish Lake Chautauqua in Western New York, Bishop Atkins was likewise a leading spirit in the development of Lake Junaluska in Western North Carolina.

Bishop James C. Baker, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1928, deserves a prominent place in the story of the bishops who have been primarily educators, for he was the father of a new and unique type of educational ministry. In 1907, he was appointed by Bishop McDowell to Trinity Church, Urbana, Illinois, located near the campus of the University of Illinois. Here, in 1913, with the support of the conferences in Illinois, he succeeded in establishing the first Wesley Foundation. The idea of such a ministry to students upon state, municipal and private campuses captured the imagination of the church and in time Wesley Foundations were springing up throughout the land. Such

developments were not without opposition, however, in the conferences and in the church press especially upon the part of some who saw therein some possible rivalry to the claims of established schools of the church for the church's support. Bishop Baker lived to see the dream of his younger years fully realized and the student movement firmly established in Methodism as a unique and significant educational ministry.

Bishop Clare Purcell was not an educator, but he was friendly to the cause of education and particularly to the idea of an educated ministry. In one of the last General Conferences of the Church South, Purcell was a delegate. A proposal was under consideration to lift the educational standards for the ministry. One delegate observed, "If you pass this proposed legislation, you will make the requirements so high that Abraham Lincoln couldn't be admitted into the Methodist ministry." Purcell immediately got the floor and captured the conference as he said quietly, "Yes, but Robert E. Lee could."

## XIV

# The Scholars

The earliest bishops of Methodism were primarily evangelists and church builders. For the most part they lived almost continuously on the road, and no one of them knew the quiet of a book-lined study to which he could occasionally repair. In the midst of their travels, they did strive valiantly to maintain some study habits, particularly study of the Scriptures, and like Wesley, they did urge the preachers to study and to place good reading material in the hands of the people. But, certainly, no one of them approached the status of a serious scholar. Asbury kept a Journal, as Wesley did. It was published long after his death and remains today an amazing record of his unceasing activity. Likewise, Bishop McKendree kept a Journal. This was never published, but liberal excerpts from it were incorporated by Bishop Paine in his *Life of McKendree*, written at the request of the 1854 General Conference of the ChurchhSouth, and these excerpts give us at least a passing insight into the labors of the dedicated bishop who did so much to type Methodism and to establish it on what was then the frontier. It is interesting to note that the Journal is silent relative to McKendree's own election.

Bishop Paine's biography of McKendree did not appear until 1869, which was thirty-four years after McKendree died. During most of these years McKendree's papers had remained in the hands of Bishop Soule, to whom they were bequeathed, but he had done nothing with them except preserve them. Bishop Paine was an ideal biographer for McKendree, for in early years he had traveled much with him, had assisted him often in preparing important papers and was his confidential friend.

Perhaps the first bishop who can be reckoned among the scholars in the episcopacy is Bishop John Emory, elected in 1832. He was a better trained man than any bishop elected up to that time. He was the book editor at the time of election, and not only did he in this capacity edit books and papers, but he also wrote. Earlier bishops wrote some sermons, discourses and pamphlets which found their way to publication, but Emory was the first bishop to be the author of several full-length books as well as of a number of short tracts. His *Defense of Our Fathers*, written in support of Methodist episcopacy, received wide acceptance and won for itself the place of something of an original standard in the field of Methodist polity. Bishop Emory died at the young age of forty-six. The Methodist world has always wondered what the story would have been had his days been longer.

Bishop Simpson, elected in 1852, was primarily a preacher and a church statesman, but he was responsible for at least one monumental book. This was his *Cyclopedia of Methodism*, published in 1878. This is a large volume consisting of over one thousand pages, double column, containing a wealth of information regarding numerous Methodist personalities, practices and developments. It is amazing that so much material could be gathered together

and put into form by an otherwise fully occupied man. This volume has been unmatched in the field of this type of book until the current day with the appearance of the new voluminous *Encyclopedia of World Methodism*, the joint work of many authors and edited by Bishop Harmon.

Bishop McTyeire, elected in the Church South in 1866, was always an exceedingly busy church statesman with his hand in many enterprises, but there was also about him something of the scholar, as might be expected in one who in earlier years had been both a teacher and an editor. During his episcopal career, he did considerable writing. His most outstanding work in this field was his *History of Methodism*, published in 1884, carrying the story of the church from Wesley's day down to the date of publication.

Another now almost forgotten scholar among the bishops is Randolph S. Foster, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1872 from the presidency of Drew University. He had previously served as the president of Northwestern for three years, and was a graduate of Augusta College in Kentucky, Methodism's first higher educational institution west of the Alleghenies, in what was then the far reaches of the country. Bishop Foster's great interest was theology, and he wrote a six-volume work in this field. While a considerable number of the bishops have written a number of books, at least a few of which may deserve to be called scholarly, not too many of them have specialized in theological writing. Bishop Foster probably did this more extensively than any other bishop.

Another genuine scholar among the bishops was John F. Hurst, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1880. Bishop Hurst had been educated at Dickinson College and at Halle and Heidelberg in Germany. He had served as a professor for six years in Bremen and Frankfurt, and for seven years as the president of Drew. He was a prolific writer and numerous books and pamphlets written by his hand came constantly from the press. In addition, he contributed regular scholarly articles to the various publications of the church. Much of his writing was in the field of church history. Perhaps his outstanding writings were his *History of the Christian Church* in two volumes, published in 1897-1900, and his *History of Methodism* in seven volumes, published in 1902-1904. He was sometimes referred to as "the Methodist Melanchthon". He accumulated a library of twelve thousand volumes, and was able to read and speak five languages.

It is one of the coincidences of Methodist history that these two notable scholars, Bishops Foster and Hurst, died within hours of each other in 1903, while their brother bishops were assembled in annual session.

Another genuine scholar among the bishops was John J. Tigert, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. He grew up in Louisville, Kentucky, and even as a youth was known for his insatiable hunger for knowledge. As a lad he drove a grocery wagon on the streets of his native city, and the tradition among older Methodists there is that he always kept an open book on the seat beside him, thus making his working hours do double duty. Quite early he found recognition for his scholarship and was appointed a professor in Vanderbilt

University, and in due time he was made editor of the scholarly *Quarterly Review* and Book Editor of the church. He, like Bishop Hurst, was a prolific writer and the twenty-two books which came from his pen covered a fairly wide field. He was the author of a *Handbook on Logic*, which at one time every fledgling Southern Methodist preacher was supposed to master, but at mastering which few succeeded. He also was the author of an impressive small volume in theology entitled *Theism — A Survey of the Paths that Lead to God*. He published his two-volume *The Doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America* in 1902. Doubtless, the most valuable book coming from his gifted pen was his *Constitutional History of American Episcopal Methodism*.

Another scholar of the Church South was Bishop Alpheus W. Wilson of Baltimore, elected in 1882. Bishop Wilson, though for long years senior bishop of the Southern Church and an ardent Southerner, had been ordained deacon by Bishop Scott and elder by Bishop Waugh, both of whom were bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This was because in 1853, when he entered the ministry, the Baltimore Conference was still attached to the Methodist Episcopal Church. During the war years there was in effect a three-way division of the conference. With the war over, Bishop Wilson went with that part of the conference that in 1866 identified itself with the Church South. The bishop had a great mind and was a genuine scholar. He lived with his Greek New Testament and made it the habit of a life-time to read four chapters in Greek each day. His sermons were theological, expository and profound. He did not do as much writing as some other scholarly bishops, but he was the author of several books, chiefly in the field of the New Testament, most of which are practically forgotten today but which still make interesting reading for those who want to study the religious thought patterns of the day in which Bishop Wilson lived.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1912, was still another scholar among the bishops. He had a particularly penetrating mind, a facility of expression and an ability to pinpoint an idea matched by few men. He was fully at home in the world of theology, the world of history, and the world of ethics. He had always the poise, the balance, and the sense of objectivity that mark the genuine scholar, and along with these, a rare sense of humor and an ability to detect sham and to puncture the balloons of the insincere by some cryptic remark that spoke volumes in a few telling words. He was the author of a number of volumes ranging a wide field including theology, sociology, history, ethics and biography.

Quite a few of the bishops, while perhaps not to be denominated primarily as scholars, did have two or more volumes to their credit.. These include Bishop Candler, who wrote chiefly in the field of Biblical interpretation and biography; Bishop Cushman, who wrote in the field of devotional poetry; Bishop O. P. Fitzgerald, who wrote in the field of works for private devotion; Bishops J. W. Hamilton and Garber, who wrote chiefly in the field of church history; Bishop Harrell, who wrote in the field of Biblical interpretation and devotional material; Bishop Holt, who was interested in the field of biography, worship and ecumenism; Bishop Kern, who wrote in the field of sermonic material, Biblical

interpretation and current problems of the church; Bishop Palmer, who wrote sermonic material, and Bishop Leete, who wrote chiefly in the field of biography.

One of the strangest works written by a bishop was one published in 1900 by Bishop John C. Keener in which he argued that the Garden of Eden was located in South Carolina and that the ark was built there, and from there floated with certain sea currents until it rested at last on Mt. Ararat. He argued from certain phosphate deposits to be found near Charleston that there was a divinely led gathering of the animals from which the selection was made of those to be taken upon the ark. The book represents an extremely literal interpretation of Scripture combined with an ingenius and highly imaginative treatment of physical data.

A strange book appeared on the market in 1890, ten years after the death of Bishop Gilbert Haven. It was entitled *Heavenly Messenger* and was purported to be a communication from Bishop Haven through a spiritualist medium.

Among the bishops still living and elected in The Methodist Church who have seen two or more volumes published are Bishops Pickett, William C. Martin, W. J. King, Corson, Nall, Kennedy, Werner, Ensley, Harmon, Stowe, Mathews, Tippett, Webb, and Short.

Several of the bishops of Methodism had the honor of delivering the Yale Lectures. These were Bishops Simpson, McDowell, Mouzon, McConnell, Oxnam and Kennedy. Bishop Mouzon was the only bishop of the Church South to participate in this lectureship.

While it is true that a number of the bishops wrote a number of books, a few of them wrote certain books which in their time had an unusual reception and which have not been mentioned thus far. Among these particular books, which had far-reaching effect, were Bishop Marvin's *To the East by Way of the West*; Bishop Haygood's *Our Brother in Black*; Bishop DuBose's *History of Methodism*, picking up where Bishop McTyeire left off and carrying the story to 1914; Bishop James Atkins, *The Kingdom in the Cradle*, a groundbreaker in its day in the field of religious education; Bishop Watkins, *Out of Aldersgate*; and Bishop Garber's *The Methodists Are One People*. Each of these books won church-wide acclaim quickly and contributed significantly to important developments in the church.

Bishop William Taylor was an evangelist rather than a scholar, but so many well-received books came from his pen that he was able to support himself by their sales. Most of Bishop Taylor's books apparently were hastily written. They are largely narratives of his unique experiences. The best known and probably most widely circulated of them was his famous *Story of My Life*, an immense oversized volume which follows his colorful career on four continents in great detail.

## XV

# The Missionaries

The first three bishops of American Methodism were all missionaries. Bishop Asbury was sent by Wesley to America as a missionary in 1771, and he never returned to his native England even for a brief visit. Bishop Whatcoat, sent out in 1784, was one of the two last missionaries to be named by Wesley to these shores. Bishop Coke was veritably a one-man missionary society. Missions represented the great passion of his heart, and he traveled far and long and gave liberally of his personal wealth to plant the seed of the Gospel. At the organizing conference in 1784, he pushed vigorously for the establishment of a mission in Nova Scotia and raised a collection for this purpose. He may properly be regarded as the first foreign minister of Methodism.

From 1784 to 1819, the church in the United States was occupied largely with its own establishment and the problems incident thereto, but in the latter year the Missionary Society was organized, with the bishops taking full leadership as they did at that period in every activity of the church under their Disciplinary mandate "to oversee the temporal and spiritual affairs of the church." Beginning with that day the bishops have always been intimately connected with what was long known as the Board of Missions, and until 1956 all the active bishops were always members of the Board. The earliest missionaries sent out by the Missionary Society were assigned to the Indians, the first being a black man named John Stewart. These in turn were followed by missionaries to the slaves, to China, to Liberia, to India, and in time to half a hundred other lands.

At first some of the bishops were sent out to other lands on special episcopal visitations. Bishop Levi Scott made the first such overseas visit in 1852. The journey carried him to Liberia and required six months of travel. Bishop Kingsley in 1868 made a round-the-world missionary journey that cost him his life. Bishop Marvin, by a circle of the globe in 1876, sent a thrill through the hearts of thousands of Southern Methodists and made them world-conscious as they had never been before. Over a long period of time the bishops were sent out annually to hold the conference sessions overseas. Finally, there came the periods of the missionary bishop who was elected for a particular field, then episcopal residences overseas, and ultimately the period of the Central Conference.

The story of the bishops of Methodism who have in one way or another been associated with the missionary enterprise reads like an excerpt out of the Acts of the Apostles or like an appendage to the eleventh chapter of Hebrews.

Among those who have been associated with the missionary enterprise, no name stands above that of the immortal William Taylor. He was by gifts and by calling primarily an evangelist, and he believed with great conviction that the best way to establish a church was to convert a church. He followed faithfully the New Testament pattern of first making converts and then organizing them into churches. He was first a missionary to California, and he had phenomenal

success there, and Methodism in California owes its establishment largely to him. With no buildings and no equipment, he took to the streets. He would stand on a street corner, raise a song, witness the gathering of a crowd, and then preach to the assembled group and call for converts. He saw converted literally hundreds of the rough and tumble characters who made their way to California during those days of excitement and they became largely the nucleus of what has long been a great church in that state. The story of how he was originally enlisted for this service has about it all the elements of the dramatic. It was Bishop Waugh who was responsible at that time for doing something about the need in California. One day, as he sat at his desk in Baltimore, he glanced out the window to see William Taylor passing by and something said to him, "There is your man." Accordingly, he interrupted Taylor's walk and succeeded in getting him started on his remarkable career in the new western country.

Later Taylor got his eye upon the far horizons of the earth, and on his own he started self-supporting missions in India, in Africa, and in Latin America. The founding of these missions comprises a truly phenomenal story and represents one of the wonders of the golden age of missions. Such missions were Taylor's own private enterprise, and he ruled them much as Wesley ruled his societies. To a considerable extent, Taylor overextended his enterprise and the line sometimes got too thin. Eventually a not inconsiderable part of the Taylor missions died an early death, but other parts lived on and some yet survive. There were those who sought to bring these missions into closer connection with the church, but such efforts usually resulted only in the creation of greater tension. At length Taylor located in order to be fully free. Upon his election in 1884 as bishop for Africa, despite the fact that he was then sixty-three years of age, he threw himself with abandon into the work and saw twelve years of service, being retired by the General Conference of 1896 "for ineffectiveness."

Following his official retirement, he returned on his own to Africa to give one more year of service, when broken health at last compelled him to return home. Twice during his days as bishop in Africa, he walked three thousand miles. He says in his record of his journeys, "I walked several times from Angola to Liberia." During his years as a bishop, as well as earlier, Taylor refused to accept a salary.

The other great missionary bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church who should be mentioned is James M. Thoburn, who was elected a missionary bishop for India in 1888. Bishop Thoburn went out to India originally as one of Bishop Taylor's self-supporting missionaries, but he never experienced the difficulty with so-called ecclesiastical restraints that Taylor experienced. He was truly one of Methodism's greatest missionaries and not only did he help move forward and type the work in India, but he had also much to do with the establishment of the work in Burma, Singapore and the Philippines. He was known far and wide for the richness of his religious experience and the mellowness of his character, and Methodism has long ranked him as one of its active saints. As Taylor was enlisted by Bishop Waugh, so likewise, though under different circumstances, Thoburn was enlisted by his presiding elder, who in turn had been interviewed on a train

by Bishop Janes, who was seeking six recruits for India. The last of the missionary bishops were Bishop Edwin F. Lee, who served in the Philippines, and Bishop John M. Springer, who served in Africa.

Twenty-seven missionaries of Methodism have been elected to the episcopacy at one time or another, and among them were some of the truly great bishops of the church. Nine of these were missionaries to India; six to Africa; three to Malaysia; three to Latin America; three to China; one to Italy; one to the Philippines; and one, Bishop M. C. Harris, had been for fifteen years a missionary among the Japanese on the West Coast.

The last of the missionaries elected as Central Conference bishops were Bishops Gowdy, Pickett, Ralph Ward, Lacy, Rockey, Booth, Wesley, Archer, Amstutz, Dodge, Stockwell, Andreassen, and Lundy.

Following the establishment by the Methodist Episcopal Church of episcopal residences overseas, many of the newly-elected bishops were thus assigned for their first quadrennium. In most cases they soon returned for assignment in the homeland, but a few chose to make a career of overseas service. Notable records at this point were written by Bishop Bashford in China and Bishop Welch in Korea. Bishop Bashford, elected in 1904 fresh from the presidency of Ohio Wesleyan, requested to be assigned to China. He gave fourteen years of service in that ancient land, all of them marked by imaginative leadership and truly significant gains. In 1908 he was joined by a younger colleague, Bishop Wilson S. Lewis, who labored faithfully with him and nobly carried forward the work begun by Bishop Bashford when Bashford had to return to the homeland in 1918 because of ill health.

Bishop Birney, elected in 1920, was another bishop who chose to spend his entire episcopal career in China. He was an ardent advocate of the election of Chinese episcopal leadership.

Fairly late in his episcopal career, Bishop Welch was assigned to an important area in the homeland, but at the end of four years he asked to be returned to his beloved Orient. It is significant that in his charming autobiography written upon the occasion of his one hundredth birthday, he scarcely mentions his United States assignment. While in Korea Bishop Welch had a large part in developing what is now generally known as the Korean Creed, which is now used so extensively in churches everywhere.

Several of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church who had not been missionaries themselves, and who did not serve on the mission field, were nevertheless missionary statesmen who at the home base had much to do with the planning and prosecution of the total missionary enterprise of that church.

The first of these that should be mentioned is Bishop Beverly Waugh, now only a shadowy figure for most Methodists, but a man who gave truly great missionary leadership in the earlier years of the last century. It was not so much what Bishop Waugh did himself as what he was successful in getting other men to do that largely accounted for his missionary contribution. He knew how to plan strategies, how to manage fiscal affairs efficiently, how to enlist personnel, and how to secure a response from the churches. For long years his portrait hung

on the walls of the old Board building at 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City, largely unidentified by missionary leaders of a later generation who were following, without realizing it, the trails that he so long ago had a large part in blazing.

Another missionary statesman whose name should be called is Bishop W. L. Harris, elected in 1872. At the time of his election, he was the General Secretary of the Mission Board and no man in his day knew the entire field as he knew it. The hardest administrative assignments in the church were given to him again and again, and he handled them with skill and finesse. One of the most difficult of these was to seek to bring the indomitable free-lance spirit, William Taylor, into line. Suffice it to say that in this particular assignment, he had less than his usual degree of success.

Bishop McCabe of the Methodist Episcopal Church was a fund-raiser for missions, particularly for home missions and church extension, for which causes he raised more money than any other person up to his day. Bishop Morrison of the Church South fell into the same category and achieved many of the same results. Each of them was a chaplain during the Civil War, the first in the Union Army and the second in the Confederate Army.

The greatest single fund-raising campaign throughout the church for missions came with the Centenary Campaign in 1919, which was a joint effort by the M. E. Church and the M. E. Church, South. It came to its climax with a month-long Centenary Exposition held on the fairgrounds in Columbus, Ohio. Multiplied thousands of Methodists made their way thither from every corner of the earth. Frederick T. Keeney was Secretary of the Centenary for the Methodist Episcopal Church, and W. B. Beauchamp was Secretary for the Church South. Following the Centenary, Keeney was elected bishop in 1920 and Beauchamp was elected in 1922.

The great missionary bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South was Walter R. Lambuth. He was born in China of missionary parents, who were a part of one of the greatest missionary families Southern Methodism ever had. He attended Vanderbilt University and joined the Tennessee Conference. As a young man he went out to Japan and helped to open the work of the Southern Church there. Later he became the General Secretary of the Board of Missions, and from this position he was elected a bishop in 1910, and was given responsibility for overseas work. He dreamed of establishing work in Africa and in 1911, in company with John Wesley Gilbert, a Negro professor from Paine College in Georgia, he made an immortal journey that resulted in the opening of work in what was then the Congo. This first journey into the far interior took long months, some of it made by river boat, and much of it made on foot. Earlier in his career, Bishop Lambuth had had some part in the opening of work in Japan, Korea and Cuba, and now he added Africa. Toward the end of his days he began to dream of opening work in Siberia, and he lived long enough to see his dream materialize with the establishment of the Siberian Mission. When World War I came, he went with the Armed Forces to France. When a commander asked him if he felt able to undertake a certain march that might prove

taxing, he answered quietly, "I think so. The last walk I took covered fifteen hundred miles." His reference, of course, was to his Congo journey. He died in 1921 in Japan, still busy trying to claim more of the world for his Lord. His last words to the church were, "I shall be constantly watching." Bishop Lambuth was a man frail in body, but he was at the same time a giant among the towering missionary spirits of all the ages.

Bishop Arthur J. Moore was popularly regarded as the great missionary leader of the Church South prior to merger in 1939. From 1934 to 1939 he carried the responsibility for all the overseas work of the church except Cuba, including China, Korea, Africa and Europe. He made thousands of friends for missions and gave splendid administrative leadership on the field. During these years he collaborated with Doctor Grover Emmons in the founding of *The Upper Room*. He served as president of the Board of Missions of The Methodist Church from 1939 until his retirement in 1960.

The missionary episcopal leaders of the church did their work well and because they did, the time came at last for the harvest of the Gospel they had preached so effectively. On what had once been mission fields, there came into being a strong and mature church with able national leadership. This was what had long been dreamed about and labored for. The era of the election of nationals as bishops had come at last. The first national to be elected a bishop was Chih Ping Wong, elected in China in 1930. He did not find episcopal administration to his liking and after several years he resigned the office. The next national to be elected bishop was Jashwant Rao Chitambar of India, highly gifted churchman, elected in 1931. Since the election of these two bishops, twenty-six other nationals have been elected to the episcopacy, until today the episcopal leadership of the United Methodist Church overseas from the United States is made up entirely of those who are native-born. Only four of the missionaries elected to the episcopacy are still living, and most of them have been retired for some time.

The Central Conferences, of course, practice the episcopal form of government along with the entire Methodist Church. In almost all cases where former Methodist units have now become autonomous churches, the pattern of episcopal administration has been retained, though in some cases with some modification.

## XVI

# Friends Of The Blacks

Black people have been a part of Methodism in the United States from the very beginning, even as they have been a part of the total national constituency. There were black members of the earliest societies and there have been black Methodist members all across the years. Today the United Methodist Church has a far larger black membership than any other Protestant denomination in the land. How Methodism has dealt with its black membership is a story that has in it many glorious chapters, and some sad chapters, but it is a story that has been told well and at length elsewhere, and it fits in only at points with the story of the episcopacy of the church.

Presumably, it is fair to say that all the bishops have been friendly to the blacks, but that some of them have been particular friends is the story to which we now turn.

Bishop Asbury, the first bishop, was definitely the friend of black people. He sought their conversion even as he sought the conversion of whites, and hundreds of them were converted under his ministry. Over and over again there appears in his Journal the notation, particularly when he was traveling in the plantation country, "We must preach the Gospel in every kitchen." He used some blacks as traveling companions, and counted others among his best friends. He licensed some of them to preach and encouraged them in their ministry. Like Bishop Coke, he hated slavery and took an early stand in favor of its abolition. The position of the Christmas Conference of 1784 against slavery had his approval, and to the end of his days he found himself in constant tension between his desire on the one hand to enforce the rule against slavery and on the other to hold the church together. There were those in his day, as there have been ever since, who saw him as compromising at this point, but however one may judge his handling of the situation, of one thing there could be no doubt and that was his sincere love of black people.

Bishop Capers of the Church South was likewise a strong friend of the black people. He was himself a man of wealth and a South Carolina plantation owner. He was a child of his times and culture and shared the general thinking at that time of the section from which he came. He accepted slavery as an institution and did not challenge the political situation which by state law not only sanctioned slavery but in some cases even made manumission impossible. Nevertheless, despite his holding a viewpoint which none could countenance now, he was sincerely concerned about the souls and welfare of black people. His first assignment as a member of conference included laboring among them, as was the case also with the beginning ministry of another Southern bishop, John Early of Virginia. In 1829, Bishop Capers became the founder of the missions to the slaves, and he gave devoted leadership to this work the rest of his days. He was elected to the episcopacy in 1846 at the first General Conference of the Church South, but he did not live to witness the final agonizing chapters in the story of

the extirpation of slavery, for he died in 1855.

The time came in the struggle over slavery when there were those bishops who believed sincerely, for a time, that the answer to the problem was colonization, and the American Colonization Society was formed and the settlement of Liberia with former slaves was begun. These Methodist bishops, along with many other people, saw colonization as a way forward. Bishops Janes, Simpson, Levi Scott and Ames all served as vice-presidents of the Society. Eventually, however, colonization, for various reasons, did not seem to provide the answer and enthusiasm for it died out.

Once colonization had begun, however, Methodism followed the ex-slaves with her missionaries, beginning with the sending out of Melville Cox in 1833. From that day on there always existed in the Methodist Church a strong attachment to Liberia. In 1858, it was decided to allow the election of a black bishop for Liberia, and Francis Burns, a black preacher from New York State, on authorization of the General Conference was elected by the Liberian Conference and consecrated in the United States. His period of service was relatively short, ending with his death in 1862, a victim of tropical disease. In 1866 another black preacher was so elected to succeed Burns, in the person of John W. Roberts, a Liberian preacher and the son of a slave woman who had emigrated from Virginia as a colonist. His service, too, was of rather short duration, and for long years no further attempt was made to provide a residential episcopacy there. The holding of the conference in Liberia during this period was provided for under the annual plan of episcopal visitation. In 1904, there was a revival of the former plan with the election by the General Conference of Isaiah Scott and his assignment to Liberia. He served until 1916 when he retired, and Alexander P. Camphor was elected to take his place and served until his death in 1919. When Bishop Matthew W. Clair, Senior, was elected a General Superintendent in 1920, Liberia was included in his assignment for his first quadrennium.

It was, however, the period of the Civil War and of Reconstruction that brought to the fore those bishops that now for a century have been regarded as the great champions and defenders of the cause of the blacks. With emancipation the Methodist Episcopal Church moved with enthusiasm into the South to help the newly-freed Negroes. In this effort it established schools, homes, churches and Annual Conferences, and in all this activity some of the bishops played an outstanding role.

The first bishop that should be mentioned in this connection is Bishop Davis W. Clark, a New Englander, elected in 1864. He had been a fiery abolitionist and was sincerely and heartily concerned with the interests of the Freedmen. It was he who had most to do with the establishment of a number of the schools for blacks and with the organization of the first of the Southern Conferences. He was himself the first president of the Freedmen's Aid Society which was organized in Cincinnati in 1866.

Beyond doubt the most colorful friend of the blacks among the bishops was Gilbert Haven, elected in 1872. He, too, was from New England, and had long been a strong abolitionist. As editor of *Zion's Herald*, he kept constantly before

his readership the concerns and the claims of the black people, and when he was elected it was with their glad approval and by their votes to the limited extent that they then had votes in the General Conference. There were those both in the episcopacy and in the councils of the church who did not welcome Haven's election, for they feared he was too radical and that he lacked the emotional balance needed in a careful administrator. His first assignment was to the Atlanta Area, which included much of the work in the deep South. There he had a rather lonely existence, being unwelcome so far as much of the white membership of his own church was concerned, to say nothing of the general community or the white Southern Methodists of Atlanta. He attended the Southern General Conference in Atlanta in 1878, but his presence was not even recognized. He went about his work steadily and efficiently and consolidated the gains that had been made under the previous administration of Bishop Clark. He was unalterably opposed to any separation or distinction of any kind based upon race, and he let his views be known without apology from the platform and in the press. He dared to differ even with such powerful colleagues as Bishops Simpson and Ames, and clashed with most of his brother bishops, including his cousin, E. O. Haven, upon the question of the wisdom of setting up racial conferences. The conflict in judgment between him and his episcopal colleagues was never resolved, and he experienced a certain sense of loneliness for the rest of his days. In 1876, he was assigned the work in Liberia. It proved too taxing for his health. Worn out in body but not in spirit, he died in 1880.

Another great friend of the blacks was Bishop Wiley, also elected in 1872. In early life he had been a missionary to China. He was one of the founders of the Freedmen's Aid Society and served as its second president. No man labored harder or more diligently and lovingly in behalf of the black membership of the church than did he. Bishop Merrill wrote of him, "The Freedmen found no warmer friend than Bishop Wiley." He was not an agitator, but worked quietly and consistently to achieve those ends which he judged right and proper. He stood with the majority of the bishops in approving the setting up of racial conferences as authorized by the General Conference of 1876. The argument which registered with him was that such conferences would offer an opportunity for development for the individual black that he could not find in mixed conferences where, particularly in that day, he was in competition with others who had had advantages he did not have. Bishop Peck put the argument which finally prevailed succinctly as he wrote simply, "They will grow faster."

Other bishops once connected with the Freedmen's Aid Society or its institutions who continued their efforts in behalf of the blacks after coming to the episcopal bench were Bishops Walden, Thirkield, Newman and Hartzell. Still other bishops assigned to the South who wrote records of significant accomplishment in behalf of the black membership of the church were Bishops Warren and Leete.

The Southern Church following the Civil War found itself totally depleted, with its people impoverished, its episcopal leadership for the most part far up in age, much of its property destroyed and its membership scattered and

disheartened. Many of its black members with the coming of freedom chose to identify themselves with the Methodist Episcopal Church as it moved swiftly into the South or with independent Negro Methodist denominations. When the General Conference of 1866 began to move in upon the reorganization of the church, authorization was given to form what Negro churches remained into Annual Conferences, if this proved to be desired by the black membership. Such a plan did not work out, and the General Conference of 1870 authorized, with the consent of the black membership, the formation of the independent Colored Methodist Episcopal Church. Bishops McTyeire and Paine, in particular, worked closely with this church in its beginning days. Together they consecrated the first two bishops of the new church, William H. Miles and Richard Vanderhorst. It was hard then for some people, as it is hard for some people now, to understand how whites who had once endorsed or had been involved in slavery could genuinely care for the Negro as a person, but the two races had lived long and intimately together and in many cases the personal attachment was close both ways.

Bishop Lucius Holsey, the fourth bishop of the new church, was from Columbus, Georgia. He had been a pupil of Bishop Pierce, who had also ordained him deacon and elder and given him his earliest appointments. His wife had once been a personal maid of Mrs. Pierce and the two were mutually devoted. Bishop Holsey had started a church for blacks in Sparta, Georgia, which was the home of Bishop Pierce. These two bishops were close friends for years, and Bishop Holsey proved to be the leading power in the episcopacy in the early period of the life of the Colored (now Christian) Methodist Episcopal Church.

The black people also had a great friend in Bishop Haygood, elected by the Southern Church in 1890. Memories growing out of the war and the bitterness of reconstruction days lingered long in the minds of many Southerners, but Bishop Haygood was among a small group of liberal leaders in church and state who were at last beginning to think in terms of a new South, and who were committed to bringing it into being. The bishop pled eloquently the cause of the Negro in a book which created quite a sensation at the time it was written and which he entitled *Our Brother in Black*. For some years he was the agent for the Slater Fund, an educational foundation established by a Northern philanthropist for the support of education in the South. In this capacity, Haygood saw to it that liberal grants went to various black educational institutions, many of them educational enterprises of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1882, he was one of the leading spirits connected with the founding of Paine College at Augusta, Georgia, an institution established jointly by the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. For long years this was the one such institution in the country operated jointly by churches of the two races.

It is almost impossible for us to realize today that despite all that was done in the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Negro over so long a period of time, years passed before a black was elected to the episcopacy, except for service as a missionary bishop for Africa. As late as 1884, when again the election of a

missionary bishop for Africa was ordered, it was William Taylor, a white man, who was elected, although there were blacks who could be voted for and were voted for. The same situation obtained when Bishop Hartzell was elected in 1896 to succeed Bishop Taylor. Efforts to elect a black in a general episcopal election failed again in the earlier years of this century. Sentiment gradually increased, however, for the election of black bishops for service in the United States or elsewhere, and in 1920, following in the wake of the enthusiasm generated by the Centenary Movement when the election of fourteen new bishops was ordered, two Negro bishops were elected. Such election was guaranteed by ordering election upon a separate ballot. The bishops thus elected were Robert E. Jones and Matthew W. Clair, Senior. Bishop Alexander P. Shaw was likewise elected on a separate ballot in 1936. With the coming of the Central Jurisdiction in 1939, the regular election of Negro bishops was assured. During the seven quadrennia that the Central Jurisdiction was in existence, it elected fourteen ministers to the episcopacy of the church, the last of these being Bishop L. Scott Allen, elected in the final session of the Central Jurisdictional Conference in 1967. Of the fourteen, Bishops Brooks, Bowen, Taylor and Allen were editors when elected; Bishops W. A. C. Hughes, Love, Golden and Thomas were board staff members; Bishop W. J. King was president of a seminary; Bishop M. L. Harris was a college president, and Bishops L. H. King, Kelly, Clair, Jr. and Noah Moore were pastors. The first native black bishops to be elected in Africa were Bishop John Wesley Shungu and Bishop E. A. Zunguze, elected in 1964.

With the coming of Methodist-Evangelical United Brethren Union in 1968, the Negro bishops, active and retired, were allocated among the several jurisdictions, and the church decided thenceforth to trust the regular processes of election to assure black representation in the episcopacy of the church.

## XVII

# The Social Reformers

The organizing conference of Methodism in the United States in 1784 went on formal record stating the purpose of the new church as being "to reform the continent and to spread Scriptural holiness throughout the land." The early bishops of the church apparently took it that the primary way to reform the continent was to spread Scriptural holiness, and they along with most of their constituency at that time assumed that if only people were converted, this in itself would guarantee a better society. These early bishops were all evangelists primarily, and planters of the church. The Christmas Conference did give consideration to the evil of slavery, but it gave attention to no other social problems so far as is known. Slavery remained for the next sixty years the social problem most commonly discussed in Methodist circles, with wide differences of opinion regarding it, and with the church shifting its official position at times from the original absolute one to modified approaches. At length, the attempt to deal with the problem divided the church. Following the division, the sentiment in the North against slavery became more and more solidified, and when the War came the Methodist Episcopal Church enthusiastically went all out for the War effort. Particular leaders in such church support were Bishops Simpson and Ames. With the end of the War, the concern for the extirpation of slavery was transferred to efforts to help the newly freed Negroes find education, opportunity and the full enjoyment of civil liberties. In this effort, Bishops Clark, Simpson, Thomson and Janes took strong initial leadership, and later Bishops Wiley, Foster, Walden and Gilbert Haven followed in their train.

In the period following the division and preceding the outbreak of the War, the church in the South, as a church, largely left the slavery issue alone. It is said that Bishop Andrew, who had become the occasion though not the sole cause of the division of the church in 1844, thereafter never mentioned slavery in public address or published article. When the War came the Church South poured out its prayers for the Confederate armies just as the church in the North did for the armies of the Union.

The first of the out and out political bishops were Simpson and Ames, beginning about the time of the War. Bishop Simpson was a friend of Lincoln and Bishop Ames was a friend of Stanton, the Secretary of War. Both men were particularly active politically during the period of hostilities. Simpson made numerous trips to Washington to interview Lincoln on matters of state, and he did not wait for an invitation. Lincoln regarded him as a confidant and placed high value upon his counsel. It was natural, therefore, that he should be called to Springfield to conduct the funeral of the martyred president. He was not only the confidant of Lincoln, but he was also a cousin of Grant. He worked closely with the radicals who sought the impeachment of Andrew Johnson and welcomed the impeachment resolution. Subsequently, he was also the confidant of Presidents Grant, Garfield, Arthur and Hayes. Without apology he asked for

political favors for Methodists and took the position that as Methodists then represented the largest church group in the nation, so they should also have a majority of the political offices. His chief biographer holds that essentially he was not a reformer, but he did feel strongly that it was perfectly proper for the church to "meddle in politics." His role as a bishop in national politics was never again quite matched by any of his episcopal brethren.

Some of the bishops were close to another president, President McKinley, who was a Methodist from Ohio. He was himself a committed churchman, the son of a devoted mother who had once declared that she would rather see her son a Methodist bishop than President of the United States. When McKinley died, Bishop E. G. Andrews delivered his funeral oration. The services were in charge of Charles Locke, later bishop, in the absence of his pastor, Frank Bristol, also later a bishop and who was attending the Ecumenical Conference in London at the time. While these bishops were close to McKinley, none of them appears to have had the political influence which Bishop Simpson had in his day in his associations with Lincoln and some of the presidents following.

Bishop Gilbert Haven likewise was active in political affairs, both during his earlier career as an editor and during his career as a bishop. His strong advocacy of a third term for President Grant exposed him to strong criticism even upon the part of some persons who had until then been his devoted friends and followers.

The Southern bishops of the same period moved in the opposite direction and for the most part avoided politics, even local politics, almost altogether. Bishop Paine, elected in 1846, chose never to vote, feeling that the exercise of suffrage was incompatible with piety, at least so far as he himself was concerned. Bishop Haygood in later life, strange to say, took the same position, despite the fact that he was once the leading advocate in the Church South of racial social change.

As at mid-century the Methodist Episcopal Church was led definitely into the political arena under the leadership of Bishop Simpson, so in the late years of the century and the early years of the twentieth century, it moved definitely and without apology into the realm of politics again, this time over the liquor question. The Anti-Saloon League and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union had no stronger support than that given by the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in the battle that eventually resulted in the adoption of national prohibition, the Methodist Board of Temperance was a strong force to be reckoned with in Washington. Much of the leadership came from the laity and the general clergy, but there was strong episcopal leadership also to be reckoned with, such as that of Bishops Merrill, McDowell, Fisher and Nicholson.

Sentiment was likewise strong in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South against the liquor traffic and in favor of prohibition. Generally speaking, however, the episcopal leadership of the Church South did not move into the battle for the establishment of prohibition or for its retention in an all-out unquestioning way, with the exception of Bishop James Cannon, Jr. Bishop Cannon became one of the most powerful dry figures in the country, and proved

to be politically skillful and adroit. He was sometimes called the "Dry Messiah". He was often credited with being the major factor in the defeat of Alfred E. Smith and the wet forces in 1928. While some of his fellow bishops, such as DuBose, Mouzon and John Moore, were in fact as sincerely dry as he was and issued a statement declaring their opposition to the election of Smith, they could not at all times go along with Bishop Cannon's leadership. The merciless attempts of his political enemies to retaliate and to embarrass him as much as possible finally created an impression with many people that he was too vulnerable for comfort at several points. He continued to battle the liquor forces to the end of his days and was able to come successfully through several civil and church trials, but he was largely a lost leader after 1930. His popularity in his late days remained much higher in the North than in the Southland out of which he came.

Many of the same forces in the Methodist Episcopal Church that in this period battled the liquor traffic were opposed likewise to tobacco. Quite early, a law was adopted forbidding preachers to use tobacco, and it was generally respected and rigidly enforced. A similar law was not passed in the Church South until the General Conference of 1914, largely as a result of the efforts of the holiness group in the General Conference. Much of the South was tobacco country, and strong feeling against its use was not common there except among the holiness people. Some of the Southern bishops were not in sympathy with this regulation of the ministry. A few of them, like Bishops Dickey, McMurry, Kilgo, Denny and others, smoked tobacco, and they found themselves at the Annual Conferences in the rather dubious position of having to ask young ministers to abstain from doing that which they did themselves, as all the conference usually knew full well.

The early years of the twentieth century witnessed the rise of the Social Gospel emphasis under the inspiration of such religious leaders as Walter Rauschenbusch, Washington Gladden, Frank Mason North and others. This movement profoundly affected Methodism as it did most other churches, and it shared in furnishing its own full quota of social prophets, some of whom were among the bishops of the church.

One of these was Bishop Herbert Welch, elected by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1916 from the presidency of Ohio Wesleyan. Bishop Welch was ardently committed to social reform and was one of the leaders in the formation of the Methodist Federation for Social Service in 1907. This group at that time was composed of some of the most progressive and balanced spirits in the church, all of them believing ardently that the Gospel had not only personal but also social implications. The Federation was in fact something of a caucus in a day when the time of numerous caucuses in the church advocating various specifics was yet fifty years in the future. It did have tremendous effect upon the General Conference and in 1908 witnessed the formal adoption, largely under its influence, of the Methodist Social Creed, adopted likewise almost in toto by the Federal Council of Churches in 1909. In all of this activity and in every attempt of the Methodist Church at social betterment for the next fifty years, Bishop Welch

played a significant part. What impressed one most about the role he thus played was his unfailing wisdom and judgment, his quiet poise, his contagious optimism for the future, his deep serenity of spirit, and his methodical and faithful prosecution of that to which he had once set his hand. It was most fitting that long after his official retirement he should continue to be active as the church called upon him, and that his last active service should be when he was in his eighties as the executive of the Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief.

The Methodist bishop who attained the widest reputation as a social prophet was Bishop Francis J. McConnell. His scintillating mind, his depth of insight, his keen humor and his unusual facility of expression were all dedicated to the propagation of the Social Gospel. He wrote books, delivered lectures, preached sermons and sponsored measures directed at social reform. He inspired the preachers and lay persons who worked with him to commit themselves to the establishment of a better society, and sometimes in his own adroit, inimitable way he nettled his episcopal colleagues who, as he saw it, were not facing the social situation realistically and in a fully Christian way. There were those both in the episcopacy and in the church at large who sometimes feared that he would go too far in his positions and in his efforts, and there were some Methodist business persons who held strong feeling against him because they feared that some of their hope of gain would be gone as a result of his efforts. He not only wrote and spoke about social problems, but he moved personally again and again into the social arena to do battle. The move of this nature which brought him the greatest publicity was his activity with reference to the steel strike in 1919, when he was bishop of the Pittsburgh Area at the heart of America's steel empire.

Bishop McConnell largely typed the social thinking of Methodism for a period of almost forty years, and many of the bishops of the period between 1912 and the present were among his disciples. Perhaps the most prominent of these was Bishop Oxnam, who was in the forefront of almost all the battles for social reform in his day, and whose continuing conflict with the destructive forces in society came to its sharpest focus in his hearing in 1953 before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It was then that they, to their embarrassment, and all America learned that he was a person abundantly able to defend himself and his social positions.

The episcopacy of the Southern Church in this period did not have within its ranks any bishop who because of his commitment to the Social Gospel attained such prominence as did Bishops Welch, McConnell and Oxnam. Bishop Cannon was an avowed advocate of the Social Gospel, but despite his activities in the field of temperance and prohibition, he did not give too much leadership upon other social issues. Among the bishops of the Church South, however, there were some in this period who definitely deserved to be ranked as social prophets. These include particularly Bishop Mouzon and Bishop Kern, both of whom truly caught and reflected the spirit of the Social Gospel.

## XVIII

# The Advocates Of Broader Relationships

The bishops of Methodism, as a whole, have been ardently attached to the church of their fathers and have been Methodists first and last. While they have been generally friendly to other denominations, they have quite naturally and properly felt a concern to build up the church which has called them to episcopal leadership. There have been some bishops, however, who at the same time have been strong advocates of broader relations with other churches, and who have made significant contributions toward the establishment of such relationships.

In the beginning period, the bishops accepted as their primary task the planting of a church and they gave themselves to this task with complete abandon. Bishop Asbury enjoyed friendly relationships with certain warm evangelical spirits such as Philip William Otterbein and Martin Boehm of the United Brethren, father of Henry Boehm, a Methodist and frequently Asbury's traveling companion. He also knew Jacob Albright well and esteemed him highly. For a period Albright was a member of a Methodist society and was licensed as a local preacher. But while Asbury enjoyed such relationships, he concentrated his attention upon the development of English-speaking Methodist congregations. This concentration led him to look with disfavor upon beginning work among German-speaking immigrants or upon entering into union with evangelical groups working among the Germans for fear of overextension. Otherwise, union with the United Brethren and Evangelicals might have come a century and a half before it did.

The first move in the direction of establishing relationships with other churches apparently began with the establishment of informal relationships with the mother church of Great Britain. After the formal separation from the mother church in 1784, and as long as Wesley lived, contact with British Methodism was primarily by way of occasional correspondence with the spiritual father of Methodism. Due deference was paid to him for what he was, and at times his name was carried in the American Minutes, but there was no feeling that he had any authority over the American church. Bishop Coke, from 1784 until his death in 1814, shuttled back and forth occasionally between England and the United States, thus affording some connection with the mother church, but most of his time was spent in England and elsewhere, and he became more and more, so far as Methodism in the United States was concerned, a bishop in name only. Following the death of Bishop Coke, there was a period of some years when there was little or no contact of significance with British Methodism. In this period far-reaching changes were taking place both in British Methodism and in American Methodism.

At length, beginning early in the nineteenth century, informal relations were established with the mother church with the introduction of the custom of

exchanging fraternal messengers. This custom was continued with some degree of regularity for the next hundred years, and more.

The first fraternal messenger of American Methodism to the British Conference was John Emory, later bishop, who was sent as such in 1820. He was at that time only thirty-one years of age. One of the things that distinguished him was the fact that he was a well-trained man, which made him unique among Methodist preachers in his day. He made a profound impression upon the British Conference, and a still greater impression upon the church in the United States when he returned home and shared the story of his relations with the British brethren. While in England he was able to work out some mutual problems of the two churches. In 1828, William Capers, later bishop, was sent as the delegate. Many other Methodist bishops since have had the honor of representing American Methodism in this capacity.

Such official representation was not, however, confined to bishops. Sometimes it was by other clergymen or by lay persons, but normally the selection of such representatives was made by the bishops of the church.

This plan of sending fraternal messengers lost something of its cutting edge in time, and at length, beginning in 1968, a concordat was approved between the United Methodist Church and the Methodist Church of Great Britain under which four representatives of American Methodism are seated in the British Conference annually with vote, and four representatives of British Methodism are seated in the General Conference with vote. Bishops Ensley, Corson, Mathews and Short were the episcopal members of the commission whose work resulted in the development of this concordat.

Historically, the next moves of significance in the development of wider church relationships in Methodism were those related to Methodist union. After the separation in 1844 and until 1864, the line of division agreed upon between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South was generally respected except in the border states, although there were some exceptions.

Shortly after the division in 1844, a group of persons, chiefly out of Wesley Chapel and with a Southern background, formed a congregation in Cincinnati which became attached to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South as a part of the Covington, Kentucky, District and it was known as Soule Chapel. For a period it was served by some of the most distinguished pastors of the Church South, including Bishop Kavanaugh. The Methodist Episcopal Church made much of the establishment of this particular church, claiming that thereby the Methodist Episcopal Church, South had violated the Plan of Separation almost immediately. The congregation was short-lived and passed out of existence in 1854.

After the Civil War the Methodist Episcopal Church moved swiftly into the South to organize conferences among the Freedmen, and among whites moving South during Reconstruction, as well as those whites long resident in the South who had been out of sympathy with the war. Leadership in such Southern organization of the Northern Church was given particularly by Bishops Davis W.

Clark, Edward Thomson and Gilbert Haven, all then new bishops, strongly supported in the Board of Bishops by older episcopal leadership such as Bishops Janes, Simpson and Ames.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South was at first too weak to resort to countermoves, but as it began to accumulate strength it in turn made sporadic sallies into the territory of the Methodist Episcopal Church and into the new country in the West then beginning to open. Leadership in the Southern move across the original line of division was given primarily by Bishop Marvin, who, despite his reputation for saintliness, remained something of an embattled advocate of Southern interests all of his days. Under his leadership churches were organized among Democrats and Northern people who had been out of sympathy with the war in Southern Indiana and Southern Illinois and in Kansas and Nebraska. The Southern Church, like the Northern Church, began to move into California, following Southern Methodists who had moved there to find new homes for themselves and new fortune. Bishop Soule, in particular, took leadership in opening Southern work on the West Coast. As the remainder of the far West began to open, it followed those of its people who moved westward and small Southern Conferences were organized in Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico, and even in Montana and the State of Washington. All the bishops took turns in holding these conferences in the West, but perhaps the bishop who may properly be regarded as the patron saint and continuing defender of this far scattered Western work in the early years was Bishop Kavanaugh.

As it was certain bishops who led in the establishing of Methodist altar against Methodist altar, there were other bishops who greatly deplored the division of the church and any resulting rivalry. Bishop Thomas A. Morris, for instance, deplored division from the beginning. On his own motion, he put in an appearance at the organizing convention of the Southern Church in Louisville in 1845. He had grown up in Ohio, had served for some years in Kentucky, had married a Louisville woman and had numerous Southern ties of affection. He was not invited to preside in the convention, but the record shows that he was privileged to "conduct religious exercises," the exact nature of which is not now known.

By the time of the 1848 General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, antagonisms had become so pronounced and bitterness so sharp that the conference refused to receive the fraternal messenger sent by the Southern Church, Lovick Pierce of Georgia. Following this, for long years there was a great gulf fixed between the two Methodisms which became still wider with the Civil War and the early days of reconstruction.

During these days of alienation there were occasional and measured contacts between the bishops of the two churches, including a visit by Bishops Janes and Simpson to a meeting of the Southern bishops in 1869. There was also what might be termed an exploratory visit made by Bishop Janes and W. L. Harris, later elected bishop, to the Southern General Conference meeting in Memphis in 1870. The purpose of the visit miscarried when Harris unfortunately spoke in terms of "coming back home." The Southern Church thought of what had

happened in 1844 as a legal separation agreed upon by General Conference vote, and not as a withdrawal of the Church in the South. Bishop Keener, elected at that session of the General Conference, took the lead in replying to Harris. Real progress began to be made later when the Cape May Commission cleared up any future confusion by taking the formal position in 1876 that both churches were legitimate branches of Episcopal Methodism.

The first successful move toward improved relations came with the appearance of Charles H. Fowler, later bishop, A. S. Hunt and Governor Clinton B. Fisk at the 1874 General Conference of the Church South, meeting in Louisville. Thereafter, for the period of the next sixty years, there followed a series of union negotiations of various kinds which culminated with the Uniting Conference in Kansas City in 1939. Among the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church taking a vigorous lead in the effort to bring the divided Methodisms together was Bishop Earl Cranston, long the senior bishop of the church. He was an ardent advocate of union and a skilled church statesman. It is said that it was he who in early years of negotiation suggested the idea of jurisdictions which ultimately proved the key to the achievement of Methodist union. Other Methodist Episcopal bishops who took a prominent place in working for Methodist union were Bishops McDowell, Luccock, Leete, Richardson, Blake and E. H. Hughes. Methodist Episcopal Church, South bishops who may properly be credited with making significant contribution were Bishops Hendrix, Mouzon, McMurry, Wilson, John M. Moore and Ainsworth.

Bishop Wilson, long senior bishop of the Church South, was strongly for union. He was an ardent Southerner, though from border territory. As has been noted elsewhere, he had been ordained as a young preacher by two Methodist Episcopal bishops. It was not without significance that when he died three Methodist Episcopal bishops were present at his funeral.

Bishops Denny and Hoss worked faithfully on some of the earlier commissions, but it could scarcely be said that they played much more of a role than that of guarding carefully the interests which they conscientiously saw themselves as representing.

Methodist Protestant leaders who contributed strongly to the accomplishment of union were T. H. Lewis, James H. Straughn and John C. Broomfield, the last two of whom were elected bishops at the Uniting Conference. Bishops Holloway and Copeland, who had been Methodist Protestants originally, were elected in 1960.

When Methodist union came at last in 1939, most of the bishops who had worked so diligently for its accomplishment had already finished their course; and now in 1976 all the bishops who led in the accomplishment of union are gone, and of the sixty-three bishops of the United Church at that time, only two bishops remain, both of them long since retired.

In the Uniting conference of 1939, there sat as delegates twenty of the later bishops of the church: Archer, Arvidson, Bowen, Brooks, Coors, Dawson, Garber, Harmon, Harrell, Hartman, Holloway, W. A. C. Hughes, W. J. King, Paul Martin, Newell, Raines, Reed, Sigg, Wesley and Short. Serving as alter-

nates and later elected to the episcopacy were Amstutz, Baxter, Brashares, Copeland, Franklin, Garth, Love, Northcott and Stockwell.

To complete the story of how some bishops have labored for union within the Methodist family and its near relatives, some reference must be made to Methodist-Evangelical United Brethren Union in 1968. All seven of the bishops of the Evangelical United Brethren Church were members of the Commission on Union. Methodist bishops serving on the Commission were Bishops Wicke, Ensley, Corson, Wunderlich and Short.

At the time of the consecration of Francis Asbury as Methodism's first bishop in 1784, Philip William Otterbein of the United Brethren assisted in his consecration; and paralleling this at Dallas in 1968 at the request of the bishops of the Evangelical United Brethren Church and of the bishop-elect, Bishop Short, the Secretary of the Council of Bishops of The Methodist Church, participated in the consecration of the last bishop elected by the Evangelical United Brethren Church, Bishop Paul Washburn.

Seated in the Uniting Conference of 1968 as delegates were the following future bishops of The United Methodist Church: Armstrong, Blackburn, Cannon, Carlton, Carroll, Crutchfield, Dewitt, Dixon, Goodrich, Holter, Joshi, McDavid, Mitchell, Nichols, Robertson, Sanders, Sommer, Stokes, Tuell, Tullis, Warman, Wertz, Wheatley, Ault and Ferrer.

Toward the close of the nineteenth century, there were those, especially among the bishops, who felt that the scattered Methodists of the world needed some opportunity for fellowship with each other and accordingly what was called the Ecumenical Conference was held in London in 1881. Almost all the Methodisms of the world participated in one way or another. Bishop Simpson, the senior bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, preached the opening sermon, and other Methodist bishops participated in the program.

Subsequently, Ecumenical Conferences were held every ten years, the site being alternated between the two sides of the Atlantic. Such conferences were held through 1931, the conference scheduled for 1941 having to be cancelled because of World War Two. During this fifty-year period, Methodist bishops who were most actively connected with the planning and conducting of these conferences were Bishops Hurst, Bowman, A. W. Wilson, Galloway, Hoss, Burt, Leete and John M. Moore. With the war over, the holding of such conferences was resumed with a conference held in Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1947. At that time, decision was made to abandon the plan of conferences each ten years in favor of the formal organization of a World Methodist Council with a staff and program of operation and with conferences scheduled every five years. Bishops Ivan Lee Holt, Fred P. Corson and Odd Hagen have served as presidents of the World Methodist Council; Bishop Prince Taylor is currently chairman of the Executive Committee; and Bishop Gerald Ensley is a member of the eight-man Presidium, and a number of other bishops have been active in its affairs.

The early years of the twentieth century witnessed the beginnings of what has since been known as the ecumenical movement. There were then certain Methodist bishops who advocated broader relationships with other churches,

and there have been some Methodist bishops in the mainstream of the movement ever since. One of the first Methodist bishops to come into leadership in the new ecumenical movement in the United States was Bishop Eugene R. Hendrix of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, who in 1908 was elected the first president of the newly organized Federal Council of Churches. Bishop Hendrix was an ideal choice for such assignment. Coming from a border state, he probably was in better position to understand the nation's people as a whole than the average person from either deeper South or further North might have been. In addition, though a Southerner, he had attended the far-famed Wesleyan University in Connecticut, where he graduated in 1867, and Union Seminary in New York, where he graduated in 1869. His early pastorates were in Kansas and Missouri in the days when strong antagonisms yet lingered in the aftermath of the Civil War. For eight years he was President of Central College, and in 1886 he was elected a bishop and served actively in that office for thirty-two years. At different times during these years he administered the work in the Orient, in Mexico and in Brazil. All these rich experiences gave him a perspective and a breadth of knowledge and understanding that might have been difficult for one whose lot had been cast in a more circumvented situation. In addition, he was scholarly, courtly and urbane and so impressive in appearance and manner that there was a natural inclination to accord him high place in any company. Moreover, his own Methodist Episcopal Church, South had been the first of all the great church judicatories to endorse the formation of the Federal Council of Churches, a fact to which he alludes proudly in the Episcopal Address written by him and delivered before the 1910 General Conference at Asheville, North Carolina. It was not to be wondered at, therefore, that the Federal Council chose him as its first president. He took the position that the achievement of organic union was not the function of the Council, but rather the doing together of those many things which the separate churches could not do alone. This concept of function has remained characteristic of the Federal Council and its successor, the National Council of Churches, for now a half century and more.

Other Methodist bishops who across the years served as President of the Federal Council or the National Council were Bishops McConnell, Oxnam, Holt, and William C. Martin. It must be acknowledged that these episcopal advocates of wider church relationships received at times not too much encouragement from their episcopal colleagues as a whole. In some cases the attitude toward ecumenical ventures was simply one of indifference, but in others it represented an honest fear that the church had more to lose than to gain by entering into such relationships.

In later years any open opposition among the bishops to ecumenical ventures largely ceased, but even up to 1968 when The Methodist Church went into the United Methodist Church, there were some among the bishops who felt that to be an ecumenical Christian in the present century did not necessarily demand endorsement of every particular ecumenical organization or of all its activities, or giving consent to every proposal for denominational cooperation or church union which might appear upon the horizon.

The middle of the twentieth century saw the birth of the World Council of Churches. There were a number of Methodists who shared in this important ecumenical development, some of them lay persons. The Methodist bishop who took largest leadership in the beginning and in the early years of the World Council was Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, who was truly an ecumenical statesman, and evidences of his guiding hand are yet to be seen in some of the basic structures of the Council. For a period he served as one of the presidents, as did also a bit later Bishop S. U. Barbieri. Mr. Charles Parlin, a Methodist layman, also served a term as a president. In due time the World Council absorbed several other ecumenical bodies, including the International Missionary Council. Bishop James C. Baker had been a leading spirit in this organization and for six years served as chairman.

The period of the 1950's witnessed several church union efforts which failed to get off the ground. A prominent leader in these was Bishop Ivan Lee Holt. Bishop Holt was a disciple of Bishop Hendrix and absorbed much of the older bishop's thinking and ecumenical concern. The same period witnessed further exploration in the field of wider relationships under the aegis of the Commission on Inter-denominational Relationships, to which Bishop Glenn Phillips gave excellent leadership. It was out of these explorations that union between the Evangelical United Brethren Church and The Methodist Church eventually came.

The period of the 1960's saw the development of the Consultation on Church Union, with which Methodism chose to cooperate and continues to cooperate. Some Methodist bishops participating actively in the earlier stages of the Consultation were Bishops Phillips, Ensley, Clair, Jr., Mathews, Lord and Palmer.

Following Vatican II, the way was opened for new working relationships with the Roman Catholic Church. Methodist-Roman Catholic Consultation Committees were set up both by the General Conference and by the World Methodist Council in which some Methodist Bishops were included. Among this number prior to 1968 were Bishops Corson, Ensley and Mathews.

The participation of United Methodist bishops in Roman Catholic-Methodist conversations after 1968 belongs to the story of the bishops of the United Methodist Church rather than to the story of the bishops of The Methodist Church.

The moves in the direction of wider relations for Methodism still continue and the episcopal advocates of such relationships in the yesterdays, though long gone to their reward, have their committed counterparts in the episcopacy of United Methodism today.

## The Bishops Of Methodism Live On

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South maintained for years in the old Publishing House at Nashville a conference room which was called the "Bishops' Room." On the walls were individual portraits of all the bishops of the Church South, arranged in the order of their election. They looked down solemnly upon every meeting held in the room and silently spoke for the church of the yesterdays to those who gathered there to discuss the concerns of a current day. In 1939, with the coming of Methodist Union, the portraits were removed and distributed to the area headquarters of the state in which each bishop was born, but so long as they remained, they bore silent testimony to the fact that the church in earth and heaven is forever one church, the church militant and the church triumphant.

Of the two hundred ninety-three bishops of Methodism between 1784 and 1968, all but sixty-six at this writing in 1976 have passed from the earthly stage. But in the truest sense, all of those who have gone on still live. According to the faith of the church and the Gospel which these bishops believed and preached, they still live as a part of the church of the first-born in heaven and of the glad assembly of just men made perfect. Bishop McConnell voiced these convictions in a most moving way a few years ago when at a memorial service held during a meeting of the Council of Bishops he paid tribute to Bishop Hughes. As he closed his remarks, he looked over his glasses in typical McConnell style and said quietly, "I missed the Council meeting last time. I was sorry not to be there. I wanted to see Ed. There were some things I wanted to talk over with him. But that can wait."

The Methodist Church, about whose bishops these words are written, is itself now gone, lately merged into the larger United Methodist Church which it is hoped, in the providence of God, may write a still more glorious record. But the bishops of Methodism in the yesterdays, like its other ministry and its laity of those years, continue to live in that "their works do follow them."

The bishops of the yesterdays continue to live in the church itself which they helped to establish and to build and to guide. When John Wesley died it was said of him that he left a well-worn clergyman's gown, a half dozen silver teaspoons and the Methodist Church. The bishops of the yesterdays all had their part in leaving us Methodism as we know it today. They helped to give the church its basic structural pattern. They helped to organize its earlier congregations. They contributed strongly to its initial and later impulses to growth. They often led in building its houses of worship, many of which still are the homes of our worshiping congregations today. Our thousands of church structures, some of them among the finest in the land, go back ultimately to the log churches whose building on ten thousand hillsides was encouraged by Asbury and McKendree, or to the missionary strategies of Bishop William Taylor or Bishop James M. Thoburn, or to the singing church extension campaign of Bishop McCabe, with

its triumphant shout,

"All hail the power of Jesus' name  
We're building two a day."

We have the church that we have today because long before our own time, "other men labored and we have entered into their labors."

The bishops of the yesterdays still live in the currents of influence they set in motion and the strong directions which some of them gave to the life of the church. Bishops Soule, O. C. Baker, Merrill and Denny still live in the church's commitment to discipline and to the ordering of church life by church law. Bishops Asbury, McKendree, Kavanaugh and Joyce, and a host of others still live in Methodism's continuing commitment to evangelism. Bishops Warne, Lambuth, Oldham, Bashford, Badley and Ralph A. Ward still live in the church's concern for mission unto the whole earth. Bishops Gilbert Haven, Wiley, Thirkield, Walden and Haygood still live in the church's concern for black people, and black rights, and black congregations, and black schools. Bishops Warren, Foster and E. O. Haven still live in the church's concern for higher education, and Bishop Vincent lives on in the church's concern for the church school. Bishops Hendrix, Cranston, Mouzon and John M. Moore still live on in the church's concern for widening church fellowship. The church of the present day does not play out the drama of its life upon an empty stage. Rather, the stage was set long ago by those who went before. Though most of the bishops of the yesterdays are now forgotten, Methodism is still living with them — with the currents they set in motion, with the work that they began, with the good that they accomplished, and sometimes likewise with the mistakes that may have been theirs.

The bishops of the yesterdays live on in the institutions and agencies which they helped to found and to which they gave strong direction. Bishop McTyeire lives on at Vanderbilt, though the institution is no longer related to the church; Bishop Hurst lives on at American University, and Bishop Candler at Emory. Bishops Waugh, W. L. Harris, Fowler, A. W. Wilson and Seth Ward live on in the Board of Higher Education and Ministry. Bishops McConnell, Welch and Oxnam live on in the activities of the Board of Church and Society. Bishops Emory, Walden, Early, Cranston and Cooke live on in the work still carried forward by the Publishing House.

Many of the bishops of yesterday live on in their disciples. Bishops Soule, McTyeire, Hurst, Lambuth, Gilbert Haven, Denny, Darlington, McConnell and Oxnam still have their disciples among the present bishops, although their names in some cases may be only names to the bishops of today.

The bishops of the yesterdays still live, in the case of a few of them at least, through published biographies or autobiographies. Biography is forever important, and one did not exaggerate too greatly when he observed, "Divide your library into two halves, biography and the rest of it." There are not too many episcopal biographies and some of them are not well written. Most of them have had only a limited circulation. But their pages, at least to some extent, make the bishops whose story they tell come alive until they walk with us once more as they

did in life.

The memory of the bishops of the later years of Methodism who have now gone on is still fresh in the minds of those who knew them. Through such memory there is realized once again, in many cases, the aspiration voiced in the words of George Eliot, "O may I join the choir invisible of those immortal dead who live again in minds made better by their presence."

While God buries his workmen, he still carries on his work. Others have now succeeded almost all those bishops who once constituted the episcopacy of The Methodist Church. It is now their lot to carry forward the beloved task, remembering that "these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect" (Hebrews 11:39-40).

## **A p p e n d i x**

## Officers Of The Council Of Bishops

### Presidents

1940-41	A. Frank Smith
1941-42	Ernest G. Richardson
1942-43	W. Walter Peele
1943-45	H. Lester Smith
1945-46	Charles C. Selecman
1946-47	Titus Lowe
1947-48	Paul B. Kern
1948-49	James C. Baker
1949-50	Ivan Lee Holt
1950-51	J. Ralph Magee
1951-52	Arthur J. Moore
1952-53	Fred P. Corson
1953-54	William C. Martin
1954-55	Charles W. Brashares
1955-56	Clare Purcell
1956-57	W. Earl Ledden
1957-58	W. Angie Smith
1958-59	G. Bromley Oxnam
1959-60	Marvin A. Franklin
1960-61	Gerald H. Kennedy
1961-62	Paul E. Martin
1962-63	Marshall R. Reed
1963-64	Paul N. Garber
1964-65	Lloyd C. Wicke
1965-66	Prince A. Taylor, Jr.
1966-67	Richard C. Raines
1967-68	Donald H. Tippett

### Secretaries

1940-56	G. Bromley Oxnam	1956-68	Roy H. Short
---------	------------------	---------	--------------

Following Methodist-Evangelical United Brethren union in 1968, the following former Methodist bishops served as officers of the Council of Bishops of the United Methodist Church.

### Presidents

1968-69	Eugene M. Frank	1972-73	O. Eugene Slater
1970-71	John Wesley Lord	1973-74	Charles F. Golden
1971-72	Paul Hardin, Jr.	1974-75	Dwight H. Loder
	1975-76	W. Ralph Ward	

### Secretaries

1968-72	Roy H. Short	1972-	Ralph T. Alton
---------	--------------	-------	----------------

## Methodist Bishops

The following tabulation of the bishops of The Methodist Church was worked out by the author after long research. There are still a few omissions where thus far it has not proved possible to secure full information.

This listing was published originally in *Methodist History*, Volume VII, Number 1 (October, 1968). Later it was also embodied in the *Encyclopedia of World Methodism* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974).

The information given is: (1) Order of election; (2) Name and dates of birth and death; (3) Ordination as deacons and elders

1784	Thomas Coke ( 1747-1814)	D Church of England E Church of England
	Francis Asbury ( 1745-1816)	D Coke E Coke
1800	Richard Whatcoat ( 1736-1806)	D Wesley E Wesley
1808	William McKendree ( 1757-1835)	D Asbury E Asbury
1816	Enoch George ( 1767-1828)	D Asbury E Asbury
	Robert Richford Roberts ( 1778-1843)	D Asbury E Asbury
1824	Joshua Soule ( 1781-1867)	D Whatcoat E Whatcoat
	Elijah Hedding ( 1780-1852)	D Whatcoat E Whatcoat
1832	James Osgood Andrew ( 1794-1871)	D Asbury E McKendree
	John Emory ( 1789-1835)	D Asbury E Asbury
1836	Beverly Waugh ( 1789-1858)	D Asbury E Asbury
	Thomas Asbury Morris ( 1794-1874)	D George E Roberts
1844	Leonidas Lent Hamline ( 1797-1865)	D Andrew E Soule
	Edmund Storer Janes ( 1807-1876)	D Soule & Hedding E Andrew & Hedding
1846	William Capers ( 1790-1855)	D Asbury E McKendree
	Robert Paine ( 1799-1882)	D McKendree E McKendree
1850	Henry Bidleman Bascom ( 1796-1850)	D McKendree E McKendree

1852	Levi Scott (1802-1882)	D George
	Matthew Simpson (1811-1884)	E Hedding
	Osman Cleander Baker (1812-1871)	D Andrew
	Edward Raymond Ames (1806-1879)	E Roberts
1854	George Foster Pierce (1811-1884)	D Morris
	John Early (1786-1873)	E Soule
	Hubbard Hinde Kavanaugh (1802-1884)	D Soule
1858	Francis Burns (1809-1863)	E Roberts
1864	Davis Wasgatt Clark (1812-1871)	D Andrew
	Edward Thomson (1810-1870)	E Andrew
	Calvin Kingsley (1812-1870)	D Asbury
1866	William May Wightman (1808-1882)	E Asbury
	Enoch Mather Marvin (1823-1877)	D McKendree
	David Seth Doggett (1810-1880)	E Roberts
	Holland Nimmons McTyeire (1824-1889)	D Janes
	John Wright Roberts (1812-1875) <sup>1</sup>	E Janes
		D Hedding
1870	John Christian Keener (1819-1906)	E Waugh
1872	Thomas Bowman (1817-1914)	D Andrew
	William Logan Harris (1817-1887)	E Andrew
	Randolph Sinks Foster (1820-1903)	D Waugh
	Isaac William Wiley (1825-1884)	E Waugh
	Stephen Mason Merrill (1825-1905)	D Soule
		E Roberts
		D Waugh
		E Hedding
		D Janes
		E Janes
		D Waugh
		E Morris

<sup>1</sup> Roberts was elected Missionary Bishop by the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1866.

	Gilbert Haven ( 1821-1880)	D Janes E Simpson
	Jesse Truesdell Peck ( 1811-1883)	D Hedding E Waugh
	Edward Gayer Andrews ( 1825-1907)	D Janes E Scott
1880	Henry White Warren ( 1831-1912)	D Baker E Ames
	Cyrus David Foss ( 1834-1910)	D Baker E Janes
	John Fletcher Hurst ( 1834-1903)	D Morris E Scott
	Erastus Otis Haven ( 1820-1881)	D Janes E Hedding
1882	Alpheus Waters Wilson ( 1834-1916)	D Scott E Waugh
	Linus Parker ( 1829-1885)	D Paine E Andrew
	John Cowper Granbery ( 1829-1907)	D Paine E Paine
	Robert Kennon Hargrove ( 1829-1905)	D Kavanaugh E Early
1884	William Xavier Ninde ( 1832-1901)	D Ames E Simpson
	John Morgan Walden ( 1831-1914)	D Simpson E Ames
	Wilbur Francis Mallalieu ( 1828-1911)	D Scott E Janes
	Charles Henry Fowler ( 1837-1908)	D Scott E Thomson
	William Taylor ( 1821-1902)	D Soule E Waugh
1886	William Wallace Duncan ( 1839-1908)	D Andrew E Pierce
	Charles Betts Galloway ( 1849-1909)	E McTyeire E Kavanaugh
	Eugene Russell Hendrix ( 1847-1927)	D Pierce E McTyeire
	Joseph Staunton Key ( 1829-1920)	D Paine E Andrew
1888	John Heyl Vincent ( 1832-1920)	D Janes E Scott
	James Newbury Fitzgerald ( 1837-1907)	D Simpson E Baker

	Isaac Wilson Joyce ( 1836-1905)	D Simpson
	John Philip Newman ( 1826-1899)	E Morris
	Daniel Ayres Goodsell ( 1840-1909)	D Scott
	James Mills Thoburn ( 1836-1922)	E Janes
1890	Atticus Green Haygood ( 1839-1896)	D Ames
	Oscar Penn Fitzgerald ( 1829-1911)	E Baker
1896	Charles Cardwell McCabe ( 1836-1906)	D Ames
	Joseph Crane Hartzell ( 1842-1929)	E Ames
	Earl Cranston ( 1840-1932)	D Pierce
1898	Warren Akin Candler ( 1857-1941)	E Early
	Henry Clay Morrison ( 1842-1921)	D Kavanaugh
1900	David Hastings Moore ( 1838-1915)	E Pierce
	John William Hamilton ( 1845-1934)	D Simpson
	Edwin Wallace Parker ( 1833-1901)	E Morris
	Francis Wesley Warne ( 1854-1932)	D
		E Scott
		D Janes
		E Simpson
		D Pierce
		E Keener
		D Doggett
		E McTyeire
		D
		E Ames
		D Kingsley
		E Scott
		D Ames
		E Ames
		D Carman
		( Canadian Church)
1902	Alexander Coke Smith ( 1849-1906)	E Carman
	Elijah Embree Hoss ( 1849-1919)	D Marvin
		E Kavanaugh
1904	Joseph Flintoft Berry ( 1856-1931)	D Kavanaugh
	Henry Spellmeyer ( 1847-1910)	E McTyeire
	William Fraser McDowell ( 1858-1937)	D Ames
	James Whitford Bashford ( 1849-1919)	E Merrill
	William Burt ( 1852-1936)	D Simpson
		E Foster
		D Bowman
		E Mallalieu
		D Simpson
		E E. G. Andrews
		D Foss
		E Warren

	Luther Barton Wilson ( 1856-1928)	D Andrew
	Thomas Benjamin Neely ( 1841-1925)	E Wiley
	Isaiah Benjamin Scott ( 1854-1931)	D Scott
	William Fitzjames Oldham ( 1854-1937)	E Thomson
	John Edward Robinson ( 1849-1922)	D Bowman
	Merriman Colbert Harris ( 1846-1921)	E Harris
1906	John James Tigert III ( 1856-1906)	D
	Seth Ward ( 1858-1909)	E Hurst
	James Atkins ( 1850-1923)	D Scott
1908	William Franklin Anderson ( 1860-1944)	E Bowman
	John Louis Nuelson ( 1867-1946)	D Clark
	William Alfred Quayle ( 1860-1925)	E W. L. Harris
	Charles William Smith ( 1840-1914)	D Doggett
	Wilson Seeley Lewis ( 1857-1921)	E Keener
	Edwin Holt Hughes ( 1866-1950)	D Parker
	Robert McIntyre ( 1851-1914)	E McTyeire
	Frank Milton Bristol ( 1851-1932)	D Doggett
1910	Collins Denny ( 1854-1943)	E Wightman
	John Carlisle Kilgo ( 1861-1922)	D Fowler
	William Belton Murrah ( 1852-1925)	E Mallalieu
	Walter Russell Lambuth ( 1854-1921)	D Newman
	Richard Green Waterhouse ( 1855-1922)	E Goodsell
		D Walden
		E Ninde
		D Ames
		E Janes
		D Mallalieu
		E Merrill
		D Joyce
		E Foss
		D W. L. Harris
		E Warren
		D Andrews
		E Wiley
		D McTyeire
		E Wilson
		D McTyeire
		E Granbery
		D Pierce
		E Paine
		D Keener
		E Doggett
		D McTyeire
		E Keener

	Edwin DuBose Mouzon ( 1869-1937)	D O. P. Fitzgerald E Hendrix
	James Henry McCoy ( 1868-1919)	D Galloway E Duncan
1912	Homer Clyde Stuntz ( 1858-1924)	D Warren E Foster
	Theodore Sommers Henderson ( 1868-1929)	D E. G. Andrews E Fowler
	William Orville Shepard ( 1862-1931)	D Walden E Foster
.	Naphtali Luccock ( 1853-1916)	D G. Haven E Scott
	Francis John McConnell ( 1871-1953)	D Newman E Joyce
	Frederick DeLand Leete ( 1866-1958)	D Hurst E Hurst
	Richard Joseph Cooke ( 1853-1931)	D Foster E Foster
	Wilbur Patterson Thirkield ( 1854-1936)	D Wiley E Foster
	John Wesley Robinson ( 1866-1947)	D Thoburn E Thoburn
	William Perry Eveland ( 1864-1916)	E Andrews E Newman
1916	Herbert Welch ( 1862-1969)	D Foss E Fowler
	Thomas Nicholson ( 1862-1944)	D Warren E Foss
	Adna Wright Leonard ( 1874-1943)	D Andrews E Vincent
	Matthew Simpson Hughes ( 1863-1920)	D Joyce E Ninde
	Charles Bayard Mitchell ( 1857-1942)	D Warren E Merrill
	Franklin Elmer Ellsworth Hamilton ( 1866-1918)	D Goodsell E Merrill
	Alexander Priestly Camphor ( 1865-1919)	D Joyce E Hartzell
	Eben Samuel Johnson ( 1866-1939)	D Ninde E Mallalieu
1918	John Monroe Moore ( 1867-1948)	D C. H. Fowler E Hargrove
	William Fletcher McMurry ( 1864-1934)	D Hendrix E Key

	Urban Valentine Williams Darlington ( 1870-1954)	D Haygood E Hendrix E Kavanaugh E Keener
	Horace Mellard DuBose ( 1858-1941)	D Galloway E Granbery D Wilson E Hendrix
	William Newman Ainsworth ( 1872-1942)	D E Walden
	James Cannon, Jr. ( 1864-1944)	D McCabe E Warne
1920	Laurens John Birney ( 1871-1937)	E Mallalieu E Goodsell
	Frederick Bohn Fisher ( 1882-1938)	D Harris E Foster
	Ernest Lynn Waldorf ( 1876-1943)	D Walden E Hurst
	Charles Edward Locke ( 1858-1940)	D Ninde E Mallalieu
	Ernest Gladstone Richardson ( 1874-1947)	D Joyce E Newman
	Charles Wesley Burns ( 1874-1938)	D Ninde E Warren
	Anton Bast ( 1867-1937)	D Walden E Andrews
	Edgar Blake ( 1869-1943)	D Vincent E Ninde
	George Harvey Bickley ( 1868-1924)	D Cranston E Spellmeyer
	Frederick Thomas Keeney ( 1863-1952)	D Foss E Fowler
	Harry Lester Smith ( 1876-1951)	D Hurst E Mallalieu
	Charles Larew Mead ( 1868-1941)	D Walden E Andrews
	Robert Elijah Jones ( 1872-1960)	D Granbery E Fitzgerald
	Matthew Wesley Clair, Sr. ( 1865-1943)	D Haygood E Keener
1922	William Benjamin Beauchamp ( 1869-1931)	D Key E A. W. Wilson
	James Edward Dickey ( 1864-1928)	D A. W. Wilson E Morrison
	Samuel Ross Hay ( 1865-1944)	
	Hoyt McWhorter Dobbs ( 1878-1954)	

	Hiram Abiff Boaz ( 1866-1962)	D O. P. Fitzgerald
1924	George Amos Miller ( 1868-1961)	E Hargrove
	Titus Lowe ( 1877-1959)	D Foss
	George Richmond Grose ( 1869-1953)	E J. W. Hamilton
	Brenton Thoburn Badley ( 1876-1949)	D J. N. Fitzgerald
	Wallace Elias Brown ( 1868-1939)	E Mallalieu
1928	Raymond J. Wade ( 1875-1970)	D Fowler
	James Chamberlain Baker ( 1879-1969)	E Newman
1930	Edwin Ferdinand Lee ( 1884-1948)	D Warne
	John Gowdy ( 1869-1963)	E Thoburn
	Chih P'ing Wang ( 1879-1964)	D Goodsell
	Arthur James Moore ( 1888-1974)	E Fowler
	Paul Bentley Kern ( 1882-1953)	D Andrews
	Angie Frank Smith ( 1889-1962)	E Merrill
1931	Jashwant Rao Chitambar ( 1879-1940)	D Andrews
1932	Juan E. Gattinoni ( 1878-1970)	E J. W. Hamilton
	Junius Ralph Magee ( 1880-1970)	D Lewis
	Ralph Spaulding Cushman ( 1879-1960)	E Oldham
1936	Jarrell Waskom Pickett ( 1890- )	D Cranston
	Wilbur Emery Hammaker ( 1876-1968)	E Cranston
	Charles Wesley Flint ( 1878-1964)	D McDowell
	Garfield Bromley Oxnam ( 1891-1963)	E Bristol
		D McDowell
		E Ainsworth
		D J. N. Fitzgerald
		E Warne
		D Neely
		E McDowell
		E Cranston
		D Goodsell
		E Warren
		D Warne
		E McDowell
		D Fitzgerald
		E Fowler
		D Hamilton
		E McDowell
		D McDowell
		E Leonard

	Alexander Preston Shaw ( 1879-1966)	D Goodsell E Warren
	John McKendree Springer ( 1873-1963)	D Hartzell E Hartzell
	Roberto Elphick ( 1873-1961)	D E Presbyterian Church
	Otto Melle ( 1875-1947)	D Vincent E Vincent
1937	Ralph Ansel Ward ( 1882-1958)	D Warren E Warren
1938	Ivan Lee Holt ( 1886-1967)	D Denny E Hoss
	William Walter Peele ( 1881-1959)	D A. W. Wilson E Hoss
	Clare Purcell ( 1884-1964)	D Hoss E McCoy
	Charles Claude Selecman ( 1874-1958)	D O. P. Fitzgerald E A. W. Wilson
	John Lloyd Decell ( 1887-1946)	D Morrison E Denny
	William Clyde Martin ( 1893- )	D Mouzon E J. Moore
	William Turner Watkins ( 1895-1961)	D Candler E Candler
1939	James Henry Straughn ( 1877-1974)	D M. P. Church E M. P. Church
	John Calvin Broomfield ( 1872-1950)	D M. P. Church E M. P. Church
1940	Wm. Alfred Carroll Hughes ( 1877-1940)	D Foss E H. W. Warren
	Lorenzo Houston King ( 1878-1946)	E Foss E L. B. Wilson
	Bruce Richard Baxter ( 1892-1947)	D McDowell E McDowell
1941	Shot Kumar Mondol ( 1896- )	D Fisher E Welch
	Clement Daniel Rockey ( 1889-1975)	D Warne E Warne
	Enrique Carlos Balloch ( 1885- )	D Neely E Bristol
	Z. T. Kaung ( 1884-1958)	D Atkins E Kilgo
	Wen-yuan Chen ( 1897-1968)	D E

	George Carleton Lacy ( 1888-1951)	D Lewis E Lewis
1944	Fred Pierce Corson ( 1896- )	D McDowell E Wilson
	Walter Earl Ledden ( 1888- )	D Berry E Berry
	Lewis Oliver Hartman ( 1876-1955)	D Fowler E Cranston
	Newell Snow Booth ( 1903-1968)	D Mead E Anderson
	Schuylar Edward Garth ( 1898-1947)	D Nicholson E Richardson
	Charles Wesley Brashares ( 1891- )	D Hughes E Bristol
	Costen Jordan Harrell ( 1885-1971)	D Hoss E Waterhouse
	Paul Neff Garber ( 1899-1972)	D Church of the Brethren E Church of the Brethren
	William Angie Smith ( 1894-1974)	D Dickey E Mouzon
	Paul Elliott Martin ( 1897-1975)	D J. M. Moore E Hay
	Edward Wendall Kelly ( 1880-1964)	D McIntyre E Thirkield
	Robert Nathaniel Brooks ( 1888-1952)	D Thirkield E E. Hughes
	Willis Jefferson King ( 1886- )	D Quayle E Hamilton
	Arthur Frederick Wesley ( 1885-1975)	D McDowell E C' am
1945	John Abdus Subhan ( 1899- )	D J. W. Robinson E Chitambar
1946	Dionisio Deista Alejandro ( 1893-1972)	D Eveland E Stuntz
	Theodor Arvidson ( 1883-1964)	D Cranston E Burt
	Johan Wilhelm Ernst Sommer ( 1881-1952)	D Nuelsen E Nuelsen
1948	Lloyd Christ Wicke ( 1901- )	D Wilson E Leonard
	John Wesley Lord ( 1902- )	D McConnell E Lowe

	John Wesley Edward Bowen ( 1889-1962)	D Leete E McDowell
	Dana Dawson ( 1892-1964)	D Mouzon E Mouzon
	Marvin Augustus Franklin ( 1894-1972)	D Denny E Candler
	Roy Hunter Short ( 1902- )	D Darlington E Dickey
	Richard Campbell Raines ( 1898- )	D E. Hughes E Anderson
	Marshall Russell Reed ( 1891-1973)	D Leete E Henderson
	Harry Clifford Northcott ( 1890- )	D Leete E Leete
	Hazen G. Werner ( 1895- )	D Nicholson E Nicholson
	Glenn Randall Phillips ( 1894-1970)	D Leonard E Leonard
	Gerald Hamilton Kennedy ( 1907- )	D Baker E Leete
	Donald Harvey Tippett ( 1896- )	D Mead E Waldorf
	Jose Labarette Valencia ( 1898- )	D Leete E Lee
1949	Sante Uberto Barbieri ( 1902- )	D Dobbs E J. M. Moore
1950	Raymond Leroy Archer ( 1887-1970)	D L. B. Wilson E L. B. Wilson
1952	Edgar Amos Love ( 1891-1974)	D Cranston E McDowell
	Matthew Wesley Clair, Jr. ( 1890-1968)	D McDowell E McDowell
	D. Stanley Coors ( 1889-1960)	D L. B. Wilson E L. B. Wilson
	Edwin Edgar Voigt ( 1892- )	D Bristol E Hughes
	Francis Gerald Ensley ( 1907- )	D H. L. Smith E McConnell
	Frederick Buckley Newell ( 1890- )	D Wilson E Wilson
	Henry Bascom Watts ( 1890-1959)	D McCoy E Mouzon
	John W. Branscomb ( 1905-1959)	D J. Moore E J. Moore

	Alsie Raymond Grant ( 1897-1967)	D Hughes
	Julio M. Sabanes ( 1897-1963)	E Hughes
1953	Friedrich Wunderlich ( 1896- )	D Oldham
	Odd Arthur Hagen ( 1905-1970)	E Miller
1954	Ferdinand Sigg ( 1902-1965)	D Nuelsen
1955	Ralph Edward Dodge ( 1907- )	E Nuelsen
1956	Prince Albert Taylor, Jr. ( 1907- )	D E. H. Hughes
	Eugene Maxwell Frank ( 1907- )	E Wade
	Nolan Bailey Harmon ( 1892- )	D Nuelsen
	Bachman G. Hodge ( 1893-1961)	E Nuelsen
	Hobart B. Amstutz ( 1896- )	D Burns
	Mangal Singh ( 1902- )	E Leonard
	Gabriel Sundaram ( 1900- )	D H. L. Smith
1960	Charles Franklin Golden ( 1912- )	E Brown
	Noah Watson Moore, Jr. ( 1902- )	D Brown
	Marquis LaFayette Harris ( 1907-1966)	E Mead
	Ralph Taylor Alton ( 1908- )	D Morrison
	Edwin Ronald Garrison ( 1897- )	E Morrison
	Torney Otto Nall ( 1900- )	D McMurry
	Fred Garrigus Holloway ( 1898- )	E McMurry
	James Kenneth Mathews ( 1913- )	D Nicholson
	W. Vernon Middleton ( 1902-1965)	E Nicholson

	William Ralph Ward, Jr. ( 1908- )	D Anderson E Burns
	Oliver Eugene Slater ( 1906- )	D Boaz E Boaz
	William Kenneth Pope ( 1901- )	D Dickey E J. Moore
	Paul Vernon Galloway ( 1904- )	D Mouzon E Dobbs
	Aubrey Grey Walton ( 1901- )	D Dobbs E J. Moore
	Kenneth Wilford Copeland ( 1912-1973)	D M.P. Church E M.P. Church
	James Walton Henley ( 1901- )	D DuBose E DuBose
	Walter Clark Gum ( 1897-1969)	D Hendrix E Candler
	Paul Hardin, Jr. ( 1903- )	D Mouzon E Mouzon
	John Owen Smith ( 1902- )	D Mouzon E Mouzon
	Everett Walter Palmer ( 1906-1971)	D Richardson E Brown
	Bowman Foster Stockwell ( 1899-1961)	D E. Hughes E Anderson
1962	Pedro Zottele ( 1903- )	D Miller E Gattinoni
1964	James Samuel Thomas ( 1919- )	D L. H. King E W. J. King
	William McFerrin Stowe ( 1913- )	D DuBose E A. F. Smith
	Robert Marvin Stuart ( 1909- )	D Burns E Brown
	Dwight Ellsworth Loder ( 1914- )	D Flint E Flint
	Thomas Marion Pryor ( 1904- )	D Burns E Nicholson
	Francis Emner Kearns ( 1905- )	D McDowell E Welch
	Lance Webb ( 1909- )	D Boaz E Boaz
	Walter Kenneth Goodson ( 1912- )	D Kern E Purcell
	Edward Julian Pendergrass ( 1900- )	D John Moore E Hay

	Homer Ellis Finger, Jr. ( 1916- )	D Decell E Decell
	Earl Gladstone Hunt, Jr. ( 1918- )	D Kern E Kern
	Robert Fielden Lundy ( 1920- )	D Kern E Kern
	Escrivao Zunguze ( 1914- )	D Booth E Booth
	John Wesley Shungu ( 1917- )	D Booth E Booth
	Harry P. Andreassen ( 1922- )	D Arvidson E Booth
1965	Prabhakar Christopher Benjamin Balaram ( 1906-1968)	D Pickett E Pickett
	Stephen Trowen Nagbe ( 1933-1973)	D W. J. King E P. Taylor
	Alfred Jacob Shaw ( 1906- )	D Rockey E Rockey
1966	Franz W. Schäfer ( 1921- )	D Garber E Garber
1967	L. Scott Allen ( 1918- )	D Clair, Sr. E R. E. Jones
	Benjamin I. Guansing ( 1908-1968)	D Lee E Lee

# Index

Abbot, Emma, 55  
Ainsworth, William Newman, 42, 48, 102, 118  
Albright, Jacob, 99  
Alejandro, Dionisio Deista, 9, 121  
Allegheny College, 76  
Allen, L. Scott, 9, 17, 94, 125  
Allen Street, New York City, 46  
Alton, Ralph Taylor, 21, 111, 123  
American Colonization Society, 91  
American University, 78, 107  
Ames, Edward Raymond, 13, 18, 29, 39, 42, 45, 51, 91, 92, 95, 101, 113  
Amstutz, Hobart B., 12, 87, 103, 123  
Anderson, William Franklin, 17, 24, 39, 48, 56, 116  
Andreassen, Harry P., 9, 87, 125  
Andrew, James Osgood, 10, 14, 19, 20, 22, 24, 34, 36, 42, 44, 55, 95, 112  
Andrews, Edward Gayer, 11, 24, 51, 53, 68, 74, 76, 96, 114  
Anti-Saloon League, 96  
Archer, Raymond Leroy, 87, 102, 122  
Armenia Seminary, 76  
Armstrong, A. James, 103  
Arthur, Chester A., 95  
Arvidson, Theodor, 9, 102, 121  
Asbury, Francis, 8, 10, 14, 15, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 45, 67, 70, 71, 81, 85, 90, 99, 103, 106, 107, 112  
Asbury College, 79  
Athens College, 37  
Atkins, James, 17, 21, 34, 79, 84, 116  
Augusta College, 76, 82  
Ault, James, 103  
Axley, James, 54  
Badley, Brenton Thoburn, 9, 107, 119  
Baker, James Chamberlain, 39, 42, 79, 80, 105, 111, 119  
Baker, Mrs. James C., 37  
Baker, Osmon Cleander, 22, 44, 74, 78, 107, 113  
Balaram, Prabhakar Christopher Benjamin, 9, 10, 125  
Balloch, Enrique Carlos, 9, 120  
Bangs, Nathan, 8  
Barbieri, Sante Uberto, 9, 105, 122  
Bascom, Henry Bidleman, 10, 21, 22, 34, 52, 54, 59, 60, 76, 112  
Bashford, James Whitford, 46, 55, 76, 87, 107, 115  
Bast, Anton, 9, 12, 118  
Baxter, Bruce Richard, 34, 103, 120  
Beauchamp, William Benjamin, 17, 88, 118  
Beecher, Henry Ward, 60  
Berry, Joseph Flintoft, 8, 15, 57, 58, 115  
Bickley, George Harvey, 18, 36, 118  
Birmingham College, 18  
Birney, Laress John, 27, 87, 118  
Blackburn, Robert M., 22, 103  
Blake, Edgar, 17, 25, 53, 56, 102, 118  
Boaz, Hiram Abiff, 10, 76, 119  
Boehm, Henry, 99  
Boehm, Martin, 99  
Booth, Newell Snow, 21, 87, 121  
Boston Avenue, Tulsa, 22  
Boston Seminary, 27, 76  
Bowen, J. W. E., 8  
Bowen, John Wesley Edward, Jr., 8, 9, 17, 94, 102, 122  
Bowman, Thomas, 10, 21, 24, 57, 76, 103, 113  
Branscomb, John W., 21, 22, 53, 122  
Brashares, Charles Wesley, 39, 103, 111, 121  
Bristol, Frank Milton, 53, 96, 116  
British Methodism, 23, 99  
Brooks, Robert Nathaniel, 9, 17, 94, 102, 121  
Broomfield, John Calvin, 9, 102, 120  
Brown, Wallace Elias, 56, 119  
Buckley, James M., 16  
Burns, Charles Wesley, 22, 36, 60, 118  
Burns, Francis, 9, 14, 77, 91, 113  
Burt, William, 8, 24, 103, 115  
Calhoun, John C., 59  
Camphor, Alexander Priestly, 9, 10, 35, 91, 117  
Candler, Asa G., 78  
Candler, Warren Akin, 10, 14, 22, 24, 29, 42, 46, 47, 48, 53, 55, 56, 62, 68, 76, 78, 83, 107, 115  
Candler School of Theology, 7  
Cannon, James, Jr., 20, 21, 43, 55, 58, 96, 97, 98, 118  
Cannon, William R., 56, 76, 103  
Cape May Commission, 102  
Capers, William, 19, 20, 21, 22, 35, 40, 42, 90, 100, 112  
Capers, Mrs. William, 40  
Carlton, Alsie H., 103  
Carroll, Edward G., 103  
Cartwright, Peter, 54  
Centenary, St. Louis, 22  
Centenary Movement, 88, 94  
Central Church, Detroit, 12  
Central College, 104  
Central Jurisdiction, 94  
Chen, Wen-yuan, 9, 120  
Chitambar, Jashwant Rao, 9, 89, 119  
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, 93

Christmas Conference, 90, 95  
 Clair, Matthew Wesley, 9, 18, 35, 39, 56, 91, 94, 118  
 Clair, Matthew W., Jr., 9, 22, 35, 94, 105, 122  
 Clark, Davis Wasgatt, 10, 17, 21, 39, 78, 91, 92, 95, 100, 101, 113  
 Clark, Mrs. Davis W., 37  
 Clark University, 78  
 Clay, Henry, 59  
 Coke, Thomas, 8, 14, 27, 31, 34, 36, 39, 85, 90, 99, 112  
 Cooke, Richard Joseph, 17, 56, 75, 107, 117  
 Coors, D. Stanley, 102, 122  
 Copeland, Kenneth Wilford, 22, 102, 103, 124  
 Corson, Fred Pierce, 76, 84, 100, 103, 105, 111, 121  
 Cox, Melville, 91  
 Cranston, Earl, 11, 17, 24, 27, 41, 42, 48, 102, 107, 115  
 Crutchfield, Finis A., 22, 39, 103  
 Cullom, Jerry, 38  
 Cushman, Ralph Spaulding, 16, 20, 39, 66, 83, 119  
 Daniels, W. V., 45  
 Darlington, Urban Valentine Williams, 28, 29, 33, 38, 47, 48, 56, 57, 66, 107, 118  
 Davis, Jefferson, 61  
 Dawson, Dana, 39, 102, 122  
 Day, James R., 7  
 Decell, John Lloyd, 21, 120  
 Denny, Collins, 11, 18, 22, 24, 39, 42, 47, 48, 51, 75, 76, 97, 102, 107, 116  
 DePauw University, 14, 76  
 DeWitt, Jesse, 103  
 Dickey, James Edward, 29, 48, 53, 57, 97, 118  
 Dickens, John, 27, 70  
 Dickinson College, 76, 82  
 Dixon, Ernest T., 39, 103  
 Dobbs, Hoyt McWhorter, 22, 57, 76, 118  
 Dodge, Ralph Edward, 12, 87, 123  
 Doggett, David Seth, 68, 76, 113  
 Drew University, 76, 82  
 DuBose, Horace Mellard, 22, 48, 52, 53, 56, 57, 84, 97, 118  
 Duncan, William Wallace, 57, 114  
 Early, John, 10, 11, 35, 38, 51, 65, 90, 107, 118  
 Easter, John, 64  
 Ecumenical Conference, 103  
 Election of bishops, 15  
 Eliot, George, 108  
 Ellis, T. D., 16  
 Elphick, Roberto, 9, 36, 120  
 Emmons, Grover C., 89  
 Emory, John, 10, 14, 17, 19, 21, 34, 35, 50, 55, 58, 78, 81, 100, 107, 112  
 Emory and Henry College, 18, 76, 78  
 Emory University, 20, 47, 76, 78, 107  
 Ensley, Francis Gerald, 21, 36, 76, 84, 100, 103, 105, 122  
 Episcopal Address, 70  
 Evangelical Church, 99  
 Evangelical United Brethren Church, 103  
 Eveland, William Perry, 55, 76, 117  
 Federal Council of Churches, 97, 104  
 Ferrer, Cornelio M., 103  
 Finger, Homer Ellis, Jr., 76, 125  
 First Church, Atlanta, 66  
 First Church, Birmingham, 22  
 First Church, Charlotte, 22  
 First Church, Dallas, 22  
 First Church, Houston, 22  
 First Church, Little Rock, 22  
 First Church, Los Angeles, 22  
 First Church, Orlando, 22  
 Fisher, Frederick Bohn, 12, 17, 55, 96, 118  
 Fisk, Clinton B., 102  
 Fisk, Wilbur, 7  
 Fitzgerald, James Newbury, 17, 34, 50, 75, 114  
 Fitzgerald, Oscar Penn, 56, 68, 69, 77, 89, 115  
 Flint, Charles Wesley, 8, 28, 39, 76, 119  
 Foss, Cyrus David, 11, 114  
 Foster, Randolph Sinks, 44, 46, 55, 76, 82, 95, 107, 113  
 Fowler, Charles Henry, 8, 17, 52, 57, 72, 75, 102, 107, 114  
 Frank, Eugene Maxwell, 39, 56, 111, 123  
 Franklin, Marvin Augustus, 22, 56, 103, 111, 122  
 Fraternal messengers, 100  
 Freedmen's Aid Society, 45, 91, 92  
 Galloway, Charles Betts, 10, 17, 42, 60, 61, 103, 114  
 Galloway, Paul Vernon, 12, 22, 124  
 Gammon, Elijah H., 78  
 Gammon Seminary, 8, 76, 78  
 Garber, Paul Neff, 12, 21, 83, 84, 102, 111, 121  
 Garfield, James A., 95  
 Garrett Seminary, 27, 67, 76  
 Garrettson, Freeborn, 70  
 Garrison, Edwin Ronald, 12, 123  
 Garth, Schuyler Edward, 10, 34, 39, 103, 121  
 Gattinoni, Juan E., 9, 119  
 George, Enoch, 14, 23, 31, 34, 36, 45, 56, 59, 64, 70, 112  
 Germany Central Conference, 76  
 Gilbert, John Wesley, 88  
 Gladden, Washington, 97  
 Golden, Charles Franklin, 9, 13, 17, 94, 111, 123  
 Goodrich, Robert N., 22, 39, 103

Goodsell, Daniel Ayres, 17, 53, 56, 115  
 Goodson, Walter Kenneth, 22, 124  
 Gowdy, John, 9, 87, 119  
 Granbery, John Cowper, 22, 68, 76, 114  
 Grant, Alsie Raymond, 9, 123  
 Grant, Ulysses S., 95, 96  
 Grose, George Richmond, 12, 76, 119  
 Guansing, Benjamin I., 9, 20, 125  
 Gum, Walter Clark, 21, 124

Hagan, Odd Arthur, 9, 108, 123  
 Hamilton, Franklin Elmer Ellsworth, 10, 36, 117  
 Hamilton, John William, 17, 24, 36, 42, 83, 115  
 Hamline, Leonidas Lent, 12, 14, 19, 33, 39, 44, 45, 46, 55, 56, 64, 75, 78, 112  
 Hamline University, 39  
 Hammaker, Wilbur Emery, 12, 119  
 Hardin, Paul, Jr., 22, 53, 111, 124  
 Hargrove, Robert Kennon, 13, 18, 22, 24, 33, 37, 114  
 Harmon, Nolan Bailey, 12, 17, 22, 56, 76, 82, 84, 102, 123  
 Harrell, Costen Jordan, 12, 22, 56, 73, 76, 83, 102, 121  
 Harris, Marquis Lafayette, 9, 18, 94, 123  
 Harris, Merriman Colbert, 14, 87, 116  
 Harris, William Logan, 14, 17, 24, 50, 75, 76, 88, 101, 102, 107, 113  
 Hartman, Lewis Oliver, 10, 21, 102, 121  
 Hartzell, Joseph Crane, 17, 34, 45, 92, 94, 115  
 Hartzell, Mrs. J. C., 37  
 Haven, Erastus Otis, 10, 21, 25, 34, 36, 45, 76, 78, 92, 107, 114  
 Haven, Gilbert, 22, 36, 37, 45, 46, 51, 57, 84, 91, 95, 96, 101, 107, 114  
 Hay, Samuel Ross, 19, 22, 50, 56, 118  
 Hayes, Rutherford B., 95  
 Haygood, Atticus Green, 7, 13, 14, 20, 22, 42, 46, 84, 93, 96, 107, 115  
 Hedding, Elijah, 23, 24, 44, 53, 58, 112  
 Henderson, Theodore Sommers, 50, 117  
 Hendrix, Eugene Russell, 10, 11, 19, 24, 37, 39, 42, 47, 48, 53, 54, 68, 102, 104, 105, 107, 114  
 Henley, James Walton, 12, 22, 39, 124  
 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, 22  
 Highlands, Birmingham, 22  
 Hodge, Bachman G., 10, 123  
 Holloway, Fred Garrigus, 12, 76, 102, 123  
 Holsey, Lucius, 93  
 Holt, Ivan Lee, 21, 42, 54, 56, 83, 103, 104, 105, 111, 120  
 Holter, Don, 103  
 Hosier, Harry, 31  
 Hoss, Elijah Embree, 11, 19, 20, 25, 29, 42, 47, 56, 76, 102, 103, 115  
 Hughes, Edwin Holt, 10, 19, 20, 36, 42, 48, 56, 61, 72, 76, 102, 106, 116  
 Hughes, Matthew Simpson, 36, 117  
 Hughes, William Alfred Carroll, 9, 10, 17, 94, 102, 120  
 Hunt, A. S., 102  
 Hunt, Earl Gladstone, Jr., 76, 125  
 Hurst, John Fletcher, 36, 55, 68, 76, 77, 78, 82, 83, 107, 114  
 Hurst, Mrs. J. F., 36

Iliff Seminary, 78  
 International Sunday School Association, 79

Janes, Edmund Storer, 10, 13, 19, 24, 44, 46, 57, 87, 91, 95, 101, 112  
 Johnson, Andrew, 95  
 Johnson, Eben Samuel, 8, 50, 117  
 Johnson Memorial, Huntington, W. Va., 33  
 Jones, E. Stanley, 7  
 Jones, Robert Elijah, 9, 10, 17, 94, 118  
 Joshi, R. D., 103  
 Joyce, Isaac Wilson, 66, 107, 115  
 Judicial Council, 26

Kavanaugh, Hubbard Hinde, 34, 51, 52, 55, 65, 77, 100, 101, 107, 113  
 Kavanaugh, Mrs. H. H., 39  
 Kaung, Z. T., 9, 120  
 Kearns, Francis Emner, 39, 124  
 Keener, John Christian, 11, 17, 21, 24, 41, 51, 53, 55, 75, 77, 84, 102, 113  
 Keeney, Frederick Thomas, 16, 88, 118  
 Kelley, W. V., 67  
 Kelly, Edward Wendall, 9, 94, 121  
 Kennedy, Gerald Hamilton, 56, 84, 111, 122  
 Kern, Paul Bentley, 13, 16, 22, 47, 53, 57, 71, 76, 83, 98, 111, 119  
 Key, Joseph Staunton, 11, 18, 37, 46, 114  
 Kidd-Key, Mrs., 37  
 Kilgo, John Carlisle, 18, 20, 97, 116  
 King, Lorenzo Houston, 9, 17, 35, 94, 120  
 King, Willis Jefferson, 9, 21, 76, 84, 94, 102, 121  
 Kingsley, Calvin, 10, 14, 17, 34, 85, 113  
 Korean Creed, 87  
 Ku Klux Klan, 48

Lacy, George Carleton, 9, 87, 121  
 Lake Chautauqua, 79  
 Lake Junaluska, 79  
 Lambuth, Walter Russell, 9, 14, 17, 21, 22, 30, 34, 88, 89, 107, 116  
 Laurel Heights, San Antonio, 22  
 Ledden, Walter Earl, 12, 111, 121  
 Lee, Edwin Ferdinand, 87, 119  
 Lee, Jesse, 8, 15, 31, 70  
 Leete, Frederick DeLand, 8, 10, 16, 52, 56, 84,

92, 102, 103, 117

Leonard, Adna Wright, 34, 56, 117

Lewis, Thomas H., 102

Lewis, Wilson Seeley, 87, 116

Lexington Conference, 13

Liberia, 91

Lincoln, Abraham, 56, 95

Lind, Jenny, 55

Locke, Charles Edward, 22, 96, 118

Loder, Dwight Ellsworth, 22, 76, 111, 124

Lord, John Wesley, 12, 56, 105, 111, 121

Love, Edgar Amos, 9, 17, 22, 94, 103, 122

Lowe, Titus, 8, 12, 17, 36, 42, 56, 111, 119

Luccock, Naphtali, 22, 25, 102, 117

Lundy, Robert Fielden, 87, 125

Magee, Junius Ralph, 20, 39, 42, 111, 119

Mallalieu, Wilbur Francis, 11, 18, 46, 114

Marcus Lindsey, Louisville, 22

Martin, Paul Elliott, 12, 13, 22, 76, 102, 111, 121

Martin, William Clyde, 12, 13, 21, 22, 76, 84, 104, 111, 120

Marvin, Enoch Mather, 13, 19, 22, 42, 54, 55, 56, 65, 84, 85, 101, 113

Mathews, James Kenneth, 7, 17, 84, 100, 105, 123

McCabe, Charles Cardwell, 14, 17, 22, 41, 52, 55, 66, 88, 106, 115

McConnell, Francis John, 10, 19, 20, 27, 36, 39, 42, 47, 48, 55, 56, 75, 76, 83, 84, 98, 104, 106, 107, 117

McConnell, Mrs. F. J., 37

McCoy, James Henry, 18, 22, 35, 117

McCoy, Mrs. James H., 37

McDavid, Joel, 103

McDowell, William Fraser, 17, 48, 53, 61, 62, 74, 79, 84, 96, 102, 115

McFerrin, John B., 8, 16

McGee, John, 64

McGee, William, 64

McIntyre, Robert, 9, 21, 22, 61, 116

McKendree, William, 14, 15, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 36, 50, 52, 54, 59, 60, 64, 70, 71, 78, 81, 106, 107, 112

McKendree Church, Nashville, 22, 55

McKinley, William, 96

McMurry, William Fletcher, 17, 22, 25, 29, 48, 53, 75, 97, 102, 117

McTyeire, Holland Nimmons, 14, 15, 16, 17, 24, 36, 41, 43, 44, 51, 57, 68, 71, 72, 74, 75, 77, 82, 84, 93, 107, 113

Mead, Charles Larew, 21, 22, 118

Melle, F. Otto, 9, 120

Merrill, Stephen Mason, 11, 14, 46, 51, 74, 92, 96, 107, 118

Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief, 12, 98

Methodist Federation for Social Action, 97

Methodist Protestant Church, 102

Middleton, W. Vernon, 17, 34, 123

Miles, William H., 93

Miller, George Amos, 18, 119

Millsaps College, 18, 76

Mitchell, Charles Bayard, 22, 117

Mitchell, Eric A., 103

Mondol, Shot Kumar, 9, 12, 120

Moore, Arthur James, 10, 13, 22, 24, 39, 42, 66, 89, 111, 119

Moore, David Hastings, 11, 34, 41, 115

Moore, John Monroe, 17, 22, 24, 25, 42, 47, 48, 51, 52, 56, 69, 72, 97, 102, 103, 107, 117

Moore, Noah Watson, Jr., 9, 12, 56, 94, 123

Morris, Thomas Asbury, 12, 19, 24, 28, 33, 36, 38, 42, 44, 53, 101, 112

Morrison, Henry Clay, 17, 22, 25, 28, 46, 51, 66, 88, 115

Morristown College, 78

Mt. Olivet Cemetery, 14

Mouzon, Edwin DuBose, 18, 22, 29, 43, 47, 48, 53, 54, 76, 84, 97, 98, 102, 107, 117

Mt. Lebanon, Pittsburgh, 22

Murrah, William Belton, 18, 76, 116

Nagbe, Stephen Trowen, 9, 10, 125

Nall, Torney Otto, 12, 17, 21, 84, 123

National Council of Churches, 104

Neely, Thomas Benjamin, 10, 11, 17, 56, 74, 116

Newell, Frederick Buckley, 21, 102, 122

Newman, John Philip, 45, 92, 115

Nichols, Roy, 103

Nicholson, Thomas, 8, 17, 96, 117

Nicholson, Mrs. Thomas, 37

Ninde, William Xavier, 67, 68, 76, 114

North, Frank Mason, 97

Northcott, Harry Clifford, 8, 103, 122

North Texas Conference, 13

Nova Scotia, 85

Nuelson, John Louis, 9, 18, 116

Ohio Wesleyan, 76, 87, 97

O'Kelly, James, 70

Oldham, William Fitzjames, 17, 35, 107, 116

Oneida Seminary, 76

Otterbein, Philip William, 99, 103

Oxford, Georgia, 14

Oxnam, Garfield Bromley, 12, 14, 16, 24, 25, 26, 39, 50, 76, 84, 98, 104, 105, 107, 111, 119

Paine, Robert, 11, 22, 24, 28, 31, 35, 36, 38, 54, 55, 68, 78, 81, 93, 96, 112

Paine College, 88, 93

Palmer, Everett Walter, 84, 105, 124

Palmer, Mrs. Phoebe, 46  
 Palmer, Walter, 46  
 Parker, Edwin Wallace, 10, 115  
 Parker, Mrs. E. W., 37  
 Parker, Franklin N., 7, 20  
 Parker, Linus, 9, 10, 17, 114  
 Parlin, Charles, 105  
 Peck, Jesse Truesdell, 10, 21, 35, 46, 53, 76, 92, 114  
 Peck, Luther, 35  
 Peele, William Walter, 22, 75, 111, 120  
 Pendergrass, Edward Julian, 22, 124  
 Phillips, Glenn Randall, 13, 39, 105, 122  
 Pickett, Jarrell Waskom, 36, 76, 84, 87, 119  
 Pierce, George Foster, 19, 24, 31, 32, 35, 38, 43, 44, 55, 76, 93, 113  
 Pierce, Mrs. G. F., 93  
 Pierce, Lovick, 35, 101  
 Pope, William Kenneth, 12, 22, 76, 124  
 Prohibition, 96  
 Pryor, Thomas Marion, 12, 124  
 Purcell, Clare, 21, 22, 80, 111, 120  
 Quayle, William Alfred, 50, 55, 56, 57, 61, 116  
 Raines, Richard Campbell, 12, 22, 39, 56, 102  
 Rall, Harris Franklin, 27  
 Randolph-Macon College, 76  
 Rauschenbusch, Walter, 97  
 Reed, Marshall Russell, 21, 102, 111, 122  
 Resigned office, 12  
 Restrictive Rules, 71  
 Retirement age, 10  
 Richardson, Ernest Gladstone, 9, 24, 51, 102, 111, 118  
 Roberts, John Wright, 9, 14, 91, 113  
 Roberts, Robert Richford, 10, 14, 23, 24, 31, 36, 38, 53, 54, 56, 59, 70, 112  
 Roberts, Mrs. Robert R., 38  
 Robertson, Frank L., 103  
 Robes, use of, 54  
 Robinson, John Edward, 9, 14, 116  
 Robinson, John Wesley, 14, 36, 117  
 Rockey, Clement Daniel, 9, 12, 87, 120  
 Roman Catholic Church, 105  
 Rose Hill Cemetery, Chicago, 14  
 Sabanes, Julio B., 9, 123  
 Sanders, Carl J., 103  
 Schäfer, Franz W., 9, 125  
 Scott, Isaiah Benjamin, 9, 17, 91, 116  
 Scott, Levi, 17, 21, 24, 37, 54, 76, 83, 85, 91, 113  
 Selecman, Charles C., 13, 21, 22, 66, 76, 111, 120  
 Shaw, Alexander Preston, 9, 17, 94, 120  
 Shaw, Alfred Jacob, 9, 125  
 Shepard, William Orville, 18, 117  
 Short, Roy Hunter, 12, 17, 21, 22, 24, 39, 84, 100, 102, 103, 111, 122  
 Shungu, John Wesley, 9, 94, 125  
 Sigg, Ferdinand, 9, 102, 123  
 Simpson, Matthew, 13, 15, 22, 24, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46, 55, 60, 76, 78, 81, 84, 91, 92, 95, 96, 101, 103, 113  
 Simpson, Mrs. Matthew, 37  
 Singh, Mangal, 9, 123  
 Slater, Oliver Eugene, 111, 124  
 Slavery, 90, 95  
 Smith, Alexander Coke, 10, 22, 115  
 Smith, Alfred E., 97  
 Smith, Angie Frank, 13, 21, 22, 36, 56, 111, 119  
 Smith, Charles William, 10, 22, 116  
 Smith, Harry Lester, 24, 56, 111, 118  
 Smith, John Owen, 12, 22, 76, 124  
 Smith, William Angie, 13, 22, 36, 66, 111, 121  
 Smithfield Street, Pittsburgh, 22  
 Social Creed, 97  
 Sommer, Ernst, 36, 39, 103  
 Sommer, Johan Wilhelm Ernst, 9, 35, 121  
 Soule, Joshua, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 23, 24, 31, 33, 38, 44, 52, 53, 56, 58, 71, 74, 76, 78, 81, 101, 107, 112  
 Soule Chapel, Cincinnati, 100  
 Southern California-Arizona Conference, 13  
 Southern Methodist University, 47, 54, 76, 78  
 South Georgia Conference, 16  
 Southwestern College, 18, 76  
 Sparks, W. Maynard, 39  
 Spellmeyer, Henry, 34, 115  
 Springer, John McKendree, 87, 120  
 Spurgeon, Charles H., 60  
 Stanton, Edward M., 43, 95  
 Stewart, John, 85  
 Stockwell, Bowman Foster, 10, 39, 87, 103, 124  
 Stokes, Mack B., 103  
 Stowe, William McFerrin, 84, 124  
 Straughn, James Henry, 48, 72, 102, 120  
 Stuart, Robert Marvin, 21, 124  
 Stuntz, Homer Clyde, 17, 39, 117  
 Subhan, John, 9, 121  
 Sundaram, Gabriel, 9, 123  
 Swift, W. A., 46  
 Syracuse University, 7, 76  
 Taylor, Prince Albert, Jr., 9, 17, 21, 94, 103, 111, 123  
 Taylor, William, 19, 30, 35, 46, 52, 53, 56, 84, 85, 86, 88, 94, 106, 114  
 Taylor University, 79  
 Thirkield, Wilbur Patterson, 36, 48, 92, 107, 117  
 Thirkield, Mrs. W. P., 37  
 Thoburn, James Mills, 30, 53, 86, 106, 115

Thomas, James Samuel, 9, 17, 94, 124  
Thomson, Edward, 8, 10, 17, 21, 32, 34, 78, 95, 101, 113  
Tigert, John James, III, 10, 21, 34, 36, 50, 75, 82, 116  
Tippett, Donald Harvey, 13, 22, 84, 111, 122  
Tobacco, 97  
Transylvania University, 76  
Travis Park, San Antonio, 22  
Trinity Church, Urbana, Ill., 79  
Trinity College, 18  
Troy Academy, 76  
Tuell, Jack, 103  
Tullis, Edward L., 103  
Un-American Activities, House Committee on, 98  
United Brethren, 99  
Uniting Conference: Kansas City, 26, 102; Dallas, 103  
University of Denver, 78  
Upper Room, The, 89  
Valencia, Jose Labarette, 9, 122  
Vanderbilt, Cornelius, 77  
Vanderbilt University, 11, 14, 18, 47, 68, 76, 77, 78, 82, 88, 107  
Vanderhorst, Richard, 93  
Vatican II, 105  
Vincent, John Heyl, 9, 11, 17, 24, 54, 57, 79, 107, 114  
Voigt, Edwin Edgar, 12, 56, 122  
Wade, Raymond J., 50, 119  
Walden, John Morgan, 11, 17, 24, 50, 54, 57, 77, 78, 92, 95, 107, 114  
Walden, Mrs. J. M., 87  
Waldorf, Ernest Lynn, 51, 118  
Walton, Aubrey Grey, 22, 124  
Wang, Chih Ping, 9, 12, 89, 119  
Ward, Ralph Ansel, 22, 87, 120  
Ward, Seth, 10, 17, 22, 34, 35, 69, 107, 116  
Ward, William Ralph, Jr., 87, 107, 111, 124  
Warman, John B., 39, 103  
Warne, Francis Wesley, 8, 35, 107, 115  
Warren, Henry White, 11, 39, 55, 76, 78, 92, 107, 114  
Washburn, Paul A., 103  
Washington Street, Columbia, 22  
Waterhouse, Richard Green, 18, 76, 116  
Watkins, William Turner, 39, 55, 76, 84, 120  
Watts, Henry Bascom, 22, 39, 52, 122  
Waugh, Beverly, 13, 14, 17, 24, 44, 53, 54, 58, 89, 86, 87, 107, 112  
Webb, Lance, 84, 124  
Webster, Daniel, 59  
Welch, Herbert, 10, 12, 16, 35, 39, 42, 47, 76, 87, 97, 98, 107, 117  
Werner, Hazen G., 21, 76, 84, 122  
Wertz, D. Frederick, 103  
Wesley, Arthur Frederick, 87, 102, 121  
Wesley, John, 53, 64, 67, 69, 70, 81, 85, 99, 106  
Wesley Chapel, Cincinnati, 100  
Wesley Foundation, 79  
Wesley Seminary, 14  
Wesleyan University, 104  
West End, Nashville, 22  
Whatcoat, Richard, 8, 10, 15, 21, 23, 31, 34, 36, 45, 67, 85, 112  
Wheatley, Melvin E., 103  
Wicke, Lloyd Christ, 12, 21, 22, 103, 111, 121  
Wightman William May, 21, 113  
Willard, Frances, 57  
Wiley, Isaac William, 14, 21, 34, 45, 78, 92, 95, 107, 113  
Wilson, Alpheus Waters, 11, 17, 18, 21, 24, 42, 83, 102, 114  
Wilson, Luther Barton, 21, 25, 48, 55, 58, 75, 103, 107, 116  
Women's Christian Temperance Union, 96  
World Council of Churches, 105  
World Methodist Council, 103, 105  
Wunderlich, Friedrich, 9, 103, 123  
Yale Lectures, 84  
Zotttele, Pedro, 9, 36, 124  
Zunguze, Escrivao A., 9, 94, 125